The New REPUBLIC

A Journal of Opinion

VOL. LXXXIV NEW YORK, WEDNESDAY, NOVEMBER 6, 1935 NUMBER 1092

Contents

The Week 345

Editorials

Europe's Breathing Spell 349
The President Hires 350
A Punctured Balloon Descends 351

General Articles

They Cry "Peace, Peace": II ..... Bruce Bliven 352
The Press Goes to War ..... Alexander Werth and Eleanor Clark 355
America and the Olympics ..... James Broughton 357
Bon Voyage ..... Dorothy Baker 358
Sonnet ..... Elizabeth Daryush 360
Washington Notes ..... T. R. B. 360
Other People's Money ..... John T. Flynn 361
On the Labor Front ..... William P. Mangold 362

Correspondence 363

Poetic Chances ..... Stark Young 365

Books in Review

Mr. Lewis Says It Can ..... Robert Morss Lovett 366
The Correspondence of Titans ..... Samuel Bernstein 367
In Simple Language ..... Lancelot Hogben 368
Harmless Hugh ..... T. S. Matthews 368
Armchair Reading ..... Slater Brown 369
The Plantation System ..... Martha Gruening 369
Coaltown ..... Powers Hapgood 370
Books in Brief 371

The Week

THIS week saw the virtual abandonment of efforts to work out a behind-the-scenes settlement among Great Britain, France and Italy to end the Italo-Ethiopian conflict before the effective date for financial and economic sanctions. Countries in sympathy with the League of Nations made definite preparations to impose the sanctions, officially scheduled by the League to begin on October 31, and Mussolini replied by ordering a general advance of all his armies in Ethiopia. Earlier in the week, Italy had made a gesture of good will toward Britain by ordering the withdrawal of a division of 15,000 troops from Libya, and there was sharp disappointment in Rome when this was not met by an answering gesture of withdrawal of some of the British naval forces now concentrated in the Mediterranean.

INTERNATIONAL diplomatic circles showed the keenest interest in the reply of the United States to the feeler sent out by the League of Nations asking the various non-League countries what would be their attitude in the event of sanctions being applied to Italy. Secretary Hull's note was politely non-committal. It called attention to our Neutrality Act, it rehearsed a long list of American moves for world peace ranging from The Hague to the Pact of Paris, and said that the United States "views with sympathetic interest the individual or concerted efforts of other nations to preserve peace or to localize and shorten the duration of war." Italy professed satisfaction with this note because the United States did not openly support sanctions. League leaders, on the other hand, were pleased to read into it "moral support" of the League by the American government.

THE Conservative government in Great Britain set November 14 as the date for a general election. By adroit political maneuvering, the Tories have taken the fullest advantage of the present international crisis, have established themselves as the pro-peace, pro-League and pro-British party, and are almost certain to be returned to power on a central issue of extensive rearmament, especially in the navy and the air force. This makes somewhat incongruous the calling of an international naval conference to meet in London on December 2. The ostensible aim is to formulate a pact to replace the naval-limitation treaties of Washington and London, but realistically the most that is hoped for is to have the Great Powers declare what their building programs for the next few years will be, and to lay a basis for some agreements as to limitations in certain directions.

THE chief domestic development of the week in France was the convention of that country's largest political party, the Radical-Socialists. By reëlecting Edouard Herriot as party leader, the Radical Socialists remain centrist, thus strengthening the Laval government and resisting the efforts of Edouard Daladier and a large section of the rank and file to swing the party leftward into definite alliance with the People's Front. The Laval government sought left-wing support by three rather weak decrees ostensibly disarming political groups and aimed primarily at the fascist Croix de Feu organization led by Colonel de la Rocque. Germany remained quiet in the international scene, but food riots re-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

sulting from the shortage of meat and butter were evidence of internal economic strain.

WITHIN the United States, the chief interest centered around the return of President Roosevelt to Washington, following a three-weeks' cruise from California. As he stepped ashore at Charleston, South Carolina, to entrain for the capital, he gave smiling assurance to welcoming crowds that real recovery has set in. Later, in a nationwide radio broadcast to open the 1935 Mobilization for Human Needs campaign, the President expressed unbroken faith in his Works Progress Administration program, and conveniently moved back from November 1 to December 1 the date for attaining his announced goal of putting 3,350,000 unemployed back to work and ending the federal "dole." The other major internal development of the week was the vote on the A.A.A. program taken among the corn and hog producers and resulting in a vote of six to one in favor of A.A.A. contracts again next year. The vote coincided wtih President Roosevelt's announced intention of making the A.A.A. a permanent institution.

NOT without its ironic implications was a week that saw the sixth anniversary of the great stock-market crash of 1929 and the embarkation of ex-Mayor Jimmy Walker, returning from "exile" in England to his native New York. What real lesson, if any, New York has learned from either Jimmy Walker or the stock market remains to be seen. One hopeful sign of learning a lesson was noted in New Jersey. Responding to widespread denunciation of one of the most unjust schemes of taxation ever devised, Governor Harold Hoffman, reluctantly and with a theatrical flourish, signed in red ink the measure repealing the state sales tax. We wish we could believe that the New Jersey repeal would halt the nationwide rush to adopt the sales tax as an all too easy means of raising state revenues.

THE nature of the three decrees issued this week by Premier Laval—which will probably be his last ones before the French Parliament reconvenes—throws a significant light on the part the actual Coalition government is preparing to play in the coming fight between the Fascist forces and the People's Front. Brazenly presented as this government's long demanded intervention in order to ensure inner peace and legality, in reality they are not only inadequate so far as the disarmament of the rightist leagues is concerned (and these rightist leagues are at present the only threat to legality in France), but are expressly designed to handicap all anti-Fascist efforts. The first of these decrees, which provides for more stringent regulations for the sale of light arms, can hardly affect the Fascist Croix de Feu, which is already heavily armed (while the People's Front is not), and has, moreover, sufficiently intimate connections with the munition makers and the high army command to arm itself at will. This decree has about the real effect on the armament of the Fascist leagues that the recent British embargo on the sale of arms will have on the Italians. The second and third decrees are an exact copy of former Chancellor von Papen's measures when he came into power in Germany. They increase the police forces and practically suppress freedom of assemblage for the anti-Fascists by requiring special authorizations to be given by the police for each political meeting. They do not affect the Fascists, whose periodic mobilizations are staged in the huge private estates of their wealthy supporters.

MR. HEARST announced his intention last week of quitting California because of its new state income tax, which amounts to a quarter of the federal income tax and was imposed in order to provide funds for relief. It appears, however, that it is too early for Californians to exchange felicitations. Mr. Hearst is legally a resident of New York, and the California authorities point out that a resident of another state, no matter how much time he spends in that golden commonwealth, is taxed only on that part of his income derived from sources within California, and that he has to pay this tax wherever he lives. The California Chamber of Commerce, directly challenging Mr. Hearst, declares that the state's community property law permitting division of income between husband and wife, makes possible a greater reduction in all taxes, and that if Mr. Hearst moved to Florida—Florida always seems to crop up in California discussions—his taxes would be much heavier. It is worth noting that the movie industry, which has associated itself with Mr. Hearst in his threats to leave the state, is now making large additions to its fixed plant. If the movie kings are not merely bluffing, they may find these concrete and steel studios difficult to take with them when they start eastward.

IT'S contagious! Another bankrupt holding company in the utilities field, unable to save its investors from ruin at its own hands, is being used to save them from that oppressor, the Congress of the United States. The bankruptcy trustees of the Central States Public Service Company have applied to the federal court in Delaware, emulating the bankruptcy trustees of the American States Public Service Company, who went to the federal court in Maryland a few weeks ago. They want instructions from the judges who appointed them to office. Is the holding-company law passed at the last session of Congress unconstitutional? All these bankruptcy trustees agree that the law is very unconstitutional. They are so advised by their counsel, and therefore convey this advice to the judges whose scouts they are. They ask their chiefs, these appointing judges, to give their appointees advice in return. A mere by-product of this advice will be a ruling on the constitutionality of the law. As luck would have it the ruling might

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

be made without the government being in the cases. This would give financial lawyers the exclusive right to appeal, and to decide whether to appeal the Delaware case before the Maryland case, in which big men at the bar and big utilities were subjected to an embarrassing publicity. Maybe this sequence could be arranged to avoid altogether the danger of the Supreme Court's dealing officially with the Maryland record and the doings of the great lawyers in that case.

THE Life vs. Art Department of this paper wishes to call attention to certain details in connection with the late efficient erasure of the Dutch Schultz personnel. For example, to the fact that even the vivid motion and false idealisms of motion pictures are not equal to the inexorable violence and cockeyed allegiances to be found in these events, which merely happened. To the fact that the art of political satire (cf. especially the limb-of-the-law, or dumb-gumshoe, division) has often made a reputation with two-line gags less dry and illuminating than the incidental newspaper statement of how "detectives roamed" (we commend particularly this conceit of detectives roaming—flat feet beside the cuspidor) "through all the resorts of the New Jersey city with orders to round up all known racketeers and gangsters for questioning," the follow-up of this, delivered with a straight face and in the same breath, being that the arrests in all added up to zero—the assumption apparently being that for detectives to be found knowing a known racketeer and gangster would be irregular to say the least. And to the fact that Mr. James Joyce has labored greatly to patent and present the world with passages no more high, deep and elegantly obscure than some from the simple shorthand record of Schultz's last words, brought out of the delirium of a mind too twisted and overweening for its time and place:

> Be instrumental in letting us know—they are English men, and they are a pipe . . . I don't know, I don't know which is best—they or us—oh, sir! get a doll, a roofing—you can play jacks—and girls do that with a soft ball, and do tricks with it—and take all events into consideration—No. No. And it is No. It is confused and says No.
>
> A boy has never wept, nor dashed a thousand-Kim, if you hear me. . . .

FIRST-HAND reports reaching us from Aztec, New Mexico, indicate some of the repression and injustice surrounding the trial of the Gallup miners. Ten men were on trial for the murder of Sheriff Carmichael, who was killed during a riot following a court hearing on April 4. Seven of the defendants were found not guilty, and the remaining three were found guilty of second-degree murder, with recommendations for clemency. Judge McGhee's notion of clemency was to impose sentences of forty-five to sixty years at hard labor. No direct evidence was presented to connect the three convicted men with the murder; indeed, the most that the prosecution was able to establish beyond question was the admitted fact that the three men were members of the general crowd at the melee. One witness said that Juan Ochoa had threatened a deputy sheriff with a hammer; a mining-company employee, whose testimony was unsupported from any other source, said he saw Manuel Avitia with a gun; a neighboring housewife said she saw Leandro Velarde replace an ice pick on his back porch after the riot. Such was the testimony that sent these three men to forty-five to sixty years at hard labor. There is a strong likelihood that Sheriff Carmichael was killed by a stray bullet from his own overarmed and overnervous deputies. In any event, the evidence showed that practically the only two men in the crowd who were in such a position that they might have killed Sheriff Carmichael were themselves shot and killed by the deputies.

SOMETHING of the atmosphere in which the trial was conducted is indicated by the attitude of Judge McGhee who, in pronouncing sentence, expressed the pious hope that the terms would never be reduced, and who jailed and held under heavy bail relatives and friends of the prisoners who attempted to distribute pamphlets or organize public sentiment in favor of the defense. A vigilante association, the United Patriots of America, was formed in Aztec, where the trial was held, and the local authorities constructed a bull-pen of high-tension electric wires around the jail in which the prisoners were confined. Gallup, where the original shooting occurred, is a mining town of 6,000 people and is completely dominated by the Gallup American Coal Company. The defendants were members of a militant local miners' union, which resisted the eviction of workers from company houses, the exploitation of underpaid miners and the abuses of a corrupt and venal city administration. The defense counsel, headed by Hugh Woodward and John Simms of Albuquerque, assisted by Wheaton Augur of Santa Fé and Messrs. Thayer and Brick, volunteers from Colonel William J. Donovan's law firm in New York City, carried on a gallant fight under most unfavorable circumstances. The Gallup Defense Committee, with headquarters at 41 East Twentieth Street in New York City, is now gathering its resources for an appeal from the harsh and unjust sentences.

FARMERS in the dairying regions of upper Illinois and lower Wisconsin, which constitute the source of most of the Chicago's milk supply, have been carrying on a strike for several weeks to obtain higher prices for their milk. The Chicago dealers now pay them $1.75—or less—per hundred pounds of milk, and the farmers want this figure raised to $2.50 per hundredweight. The situation is complicated by the fact that the farmers must apparently carry on the strike not only against the dealers but also against what is nomin-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ally their own coöperative organization, the Pure Milk Association. The rank-and-file farmers make bitter charges that the officials of the P.M.A. "sold out" to the dealers and scuttled the strike of 1934. This year the P.M.A. is opposing the strike, and there are seemingly well founded charges that the P.M.A. is helping to furnish strong-arm guards to convoy trucks through picket lines established by the strikers. The Chicago Tribune, in its issue of October 8, reported the arrest of twelve hoodlums, one of them the brother of "Machine Gun Jack" McGurn, ex-Capone gangster, who said they had been hired by Chicago dairies to guard trucks en route to the city. Despite the lack of funds and proper preparation, the farmers have made the strike so effective that Chicago was brought face to face with a milk shortage and Governor Horner and Mayor Kelly were forced to intervene. A thirty-day truce has been declared, during which it is hoped to bring about a settlement of the strike.

THE exclusion of "Tobacco Road" from Chicago by virtue of the action of Mayor Kelly in withdrawing the license of the Selwyn Theatre is one of the most outrageous cases of current censorship of the arts. The intervention of Judge W. H. Holley, an enlightened member of the federal bench, in granting a stay was met by a counter action on the part of the city, and unless public protest is successful, the play is banned from Chicago and necessarily from smaller cities in the Middle West. Once more Chicago, in which both Coquelin and Mansfield were forbidden to play "Cyrano de Bergerac" on the ground that the drama plagiarized the work of one of its leading real-estate men, is the victim of the provincialism of its officials. Mayor Kelly finds a play that has interested and informed audiences in New York for two years "a mass of filth." That Mr. Caldwell's play is a true picture of conditions as they actually exist cannot be denied. When Mr. Caldwell was challenged by Georgia newspapers as to the reality of such conditions, he offered to take a group of reporters and show them. He did. The policy of concealment, of covering up, in the interest of American complacency is especially short-sighted in view of the avowed policy of the national administration to rescue the forgotten man. The characters in "Tobacco Road" are forgotten people. Mr. Caldwell deserves the gratitude of all who honestly care for decency in American life by bringing them so powerfully to mind.

IT IS difficult to believe that Mayor Kelly is acting in good faith. The Mayor rose to prominence and wealth in Chicago as engineer of the Board of the Sanitary District. In this position he was a spectator of the orgies of this gang, carried out in junketing trips to various cities. He must have known that the funds of the district were drawn upon to pay for the pleasures of members of the Board, which, with unusual effrontery, were specified in the vouchers in words which it is not permissible to quote. This mess of filth, generally known to the public, sat easily upon Mayor Kelly's conscience. Again, during the two seasons of the Century of Progress Exposition, Mr. Kelly was not only mayor of the city but also president of the South Park Board, on whose grounds the fair was held. Every visitor knows the extent to which shows were constantly permitted whose only attraction was their obscenity. These exhibitions were offered in the most salacious terms by barkers to a multitude of people, including children. If there is such a thing as lust of the eye, that lust was appealed to by every known device; and the good name of the city was stained. The Cardinal Archbishop of the Diocese, whose spiritual lamb Mayor Kelly is, was appealed to, apparently without avail. If the Mayor is now ambitious to obtain the reputation of Cato the Censor, he has something to live down.

ANOTHER case of censorship is reported from Illinois and Ohio. This is the excision from the newsreel feature, The March of Time, of scenes depicting attacks in Germany by Nazis upon the Jews. While it is natural to attribute such suppression to official interest in protecting the ruling class from charges of cruelty, there is undoubtedly something in the excuse offered that pictures of violence toward Jews may stimulate the growing anti-Semitism in this country, especially among children, just as pictures of the lynching of a Negro may spread an infection in the South. The only rule that justifies censorship of films, theatrical exhibitions, books and speeches is a clear and present danger to the public peace and welfare. It is obviously necessary that the officers to whom such power is given should be in the highest degree persons of intelligence and disinterestedness.

JASPER McLEVY, the quiet-spoken roofer who created something of a stir two years ago by getting himself elected mayor of Bridgeport, Connecticut, on the Socialist ticket, is up for reëlection this fall. Both Democrats and Republicans are making strong efforts to defeat him, but the indications seem to be that McLevy will retain his office. Apparently the citizens of Bridgeport—as might be expected in almost any American municipality—appreciate the comparative novelty of a city administration that is at once unpretentious and honest. McLevy has reduced expenses, promoted useful improvements and given the city a generally efficient government. These, of course, are things that an honest, liberal administration of any political party might accomplish. What McLevy has not done is to institute reforms that have anything to do with socialism.

AMONG the minor horrors of the depression is the story of the old gentleman who sold candy in the streets of New York. No doubt you are familiar with it: this elderly person had owned a large and

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

flourishing confectionery business of his own. He was wiped out by the Great Debacle and reduced to penury. But was he daunted? No. He cooked up a mess of candy on the stove, peddled it in the streets, saved his profits, and now he is back again practically where he started! We admire this gentleman no end, but we are getting a little tired of his tale. It is being repeated by all the success-story magazines and writers to prove that America is still the Land of Opportunity, that there is really something the matter with the unemployed or they would have Landed on Their Feet, that government at Washington is coddling malingerers and that what we need is to send them furriners back where they came from, balance the budget and put a good, solid conservative in the White House. Even if all this were true, we should still maintain with our dying breath that the old candy man doesn't prove it, or prove anything, except perhaps that people like candy.

Europe's Breathing Spell

DURING the last few days, relations among England, Italy and France moved slowly toward a new crisis. The arrangement supposed to have been reached between the English and Mussolini two weeks ago blew up with a loud bang. Under it, the English were to have withdrawn their great battle cruisers, "Hood" and "Renown," from the Mediterranean, and in return Mussolini was to have recalled his troops from the Egyptian-Libyan frontier. Obediently Mussolini ordered a full Italian division to be brought home from Libya, but the British Admiralty withdrew only the wartime "Resolute," replacing it at once by its sister ship, "Ramillies." Meantime Mussolini had presented, through the French, a statement of his full demands, together with a request that League sanctions be postponed while it was being discussed. The Baldwin Cabinet promptly indicated that Mussolini's demands were unacceptable, and announced that Captain Eden would push through sanctions at Geneva with all possible speed. Finally, in a pre-election speech, Mr. Baldwin solemnly warned his listeners that sanctions might conceivably lead to a naval blockade, and thence to war.

These superficially ominous developments, however, bear signs of being part of a prearranged show—or more accurately, two shows, mounted on a revolving stage. One is the show put on by the Baldwin Cabinet to entertain British voters; the second is that arranged by the British Foreign Office to impress world opinion, and especially opinion in the United States. Enough has now been divulged concerning the Ethiopian negotiations for it to be certain that England, France and Italy have agreed upon the ultimate partition of all that is of value in Haile Selassie's empire. All that remains to be settled is the method by which it is to take place, and the extent of each partitioner's share. The British want the division to take place at Geneva; they want Haile Selassie's nominal sovereignty preserved and the actual partitioning to be accomplished through spheres of economic influence rather than by outright annexation, and they also propose to reserve most of fertile western Ethiopia for themselves. For reasons of prestige, Mussolini wants the partition to seem to be brought about by the victories of his armies in Ethiopia, and he has demanded—although this demand may be for bargaining purposes—a part of England's future sphere in western Ethiopia.

No deal between the British and Mussolini, however, can be announced until after the British general election on November 14. The Baldwin government is appealing to the eleven million participants in Lord Cecil's peace ballot on the basis of its devotion to the League Covenant, and until after the election it cannot strike hands with a Covenant violator. Besides this, the Tories hope to obtain a mandate from the voters for a great rearmament program, under which perhaps as much as a billion dollars will be spent on the British fleet. For this reason, the much publicized Italian menace to England's route to India must be preserved for another two weeks, and possibly until the armament debates scheduled to be held upon the opening of the new Parliament.

British firmness toward Italy, however, is not solely for election purposes. England is attempting to safeguard concrete imperial interests, and in doing so wishes to retain the world's good opinion. British Foreign Office experts foresee a difficult period ahead for Europe, due primarily to the rearmament of Nazi Germany. The time might conceivably come when England would be fully preoccupied by events in Northern and Eastern Europe, and when Mussolini, if his present ambitions were permitted to go unchecked, would be able to extort great concessions in the eastern Mediterranean, including the overlordship of Egypt. There is considerable evidence that British Foreign Office advisers advocate forcing a complete settlement of all Mediterranean questions with Mussolini now, while there is still time, and that England proposes to do this under the guise of upholding the Covenant.

England is quite willing that Mussolini obtain a slice of Ethiopia, but only in return for his pledge not to maintain fortifications or large numbers of troops along the Red Sea or in Italy's North African colonies, or to take other steps inimical to England's interests. Still more important, England is determined to obtain a promise from Laval that he will not support Italy in further African exploits. These considerations, and the coming English general election, are the realities behind England's present firmness. After his obvious eagerness last week to be saved from his own folly, Mussolini has again ordered his men to advance over high mountain walls into the interior of Ethiopia. The war that nobody now wants goes on.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The President Hires

AN INCREASINGLY important and difficult task before President Roosevelt is one in which he has thus far achieved a number of successes and a few failures. It is the task of manning government administrative commissions and boards with competent appointees. These are the agencies that will cause some of the highest legislative achievements of his term of office to live or die, redound to his credit or his discredit, serve the purposes of reform or betray them. The threat to those purposes is bound to increase in strength as the national election draws nearer; for it is in this period that the pressure on the President will increase to fill vacancies with mere politicians, with lame-duck Congressmen, or even with some Congressmen still in the House but fearing defeat and anxious to arrange for themselves a comfortable salary and an assured place in public life for a number of years to come.

Politicians do not present the sole danger. In filling some of the most important vacancies, there will also be strong pressure from Wall Street interests. This is notably true in the case of the new Federal Reserve Board created at the last session of Congress—a body that will begin to function early next year. Large financial interests (witness the trial-balloon statement recently made by President Gay of the New York Stock Exchange) are naturally concerned about the membership of the new board, and would like to have a hand in guiding the processes of appointment to it. The reorganized agency will be endowed with more than its predecessor's substantial powers over the banking system. The creation of the new agency is part of a long needed program to free the system from the domination of the small financial clique in New York.

Up to the present, this group, dominating the Federal Reserve Bank of New York, and through its commanding position giving direction and pace to the other Reserve Banks, has made these subordinate regional agencies the leaders and the central Federal Reserve Board the follower. As a result, the government has not had adequate control of the Reserve Banks operating under the influence of private financial interests, and has not had adequate control of the banking system or of credit or of money as a managed implement of business. Now, if the new board does its duty, men responsible to the President and Congress, and thus to the representatives of the people at large, may take into the domain of publicly controlled and publicly exercised functions some of the vast power that a few men, responsible only to themselves and a handful of followers, have heretofore enjoyed and exercised in private. It is to be expected that they will expend every effort to obtain Reserve Board members they like, or that, failing to do so, they may prefer a board of indifferent quality, likely to be susceptible to the persuasion of powerful banking names.

A similar problem may be presented in the next session of Congress, if it passes a bill urged by Joseph B. Eastman, the Federal Coördinator of Transportation, to reorganize the Interstate Commerce Commission. This body is receiving ever greater power in railroad finance. In 1933 it was charged with regulation of subsequent shifts in holding-company control of railroads, and in 1935 the Commission was accorded a large increase in the powers it had received, also in 1933, to participate in railroad reorganizations. Obviously, this makes it a matter of moment to half a dozen banking firms, a dozen Wall Street law establishments and two dozen or so railroad executives to get a Commission membership either inexperienced in problems of railroad control and finance and unequipped to master their seeming intricacies, or sympathetic with the point of view of the masters of our railroads. It was a member of the Commission, himself drawn from Wall Street, who some years ago said that most of his brethren were financially illiterate; and it has long been observable that some members of the Commission have been no match for the bankers and bankers' lawyers with whom they have been obliged to deal.

President Roosevelt, of course, inherited most of the commissioners and commissions now active in Washington. These do not offer so satisfactory a test of his inclinations and performance as the several new boards in whose creation he had a devoted part. In making appointments to such bodies he has generally sought at least a majority of competent board and commission members, and in these has been as successful (except in a few cases) as one can expect in a world that does not place where a President can find it enough ability to operate the governmental machinery. His appointments to the two successive labor boards were the result of an effort to establish able agencies. The same is true of a majority of the new Social Security Board, and of his selections for the Tennessee Valley Authority. In the financial field, he was called upon to man the newly established Securities and Exchange Commission. Here he avoided the two chief perils. He did not appoint lame ducks or politicians. He did not choose from Wall Street, except in the case of one commissioner who was a comparative newcomer in the stock market and could hardly be deemed the choice of the financial powers. Even this selection, while eyed askance by many who supported the President's policy of regulating high finance, is said by some observers to have turned out rather well, when measured by other appointments that seemed more in keeping with the policy of the new legislation.

The President's record with the older commissions appears to be one of frequent efforts to get good men, but somewhat spotty results. Some of his more recent selections were undoubtedly of fine quality. Caskie of Alabama, Eastman's aid in rail-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

road study and regulation, is regarded as a satisfactory appointee to the Interstate Commerce Commission. Freer of Ohio, another of Eastman's staff, known among career men as one of their able colleagues, was a good choice for the Federal Trade Commission. These appointments were made in the midst of vigorous competition by ex-Congressmen. On the other hand, some appointments to older boards have not been of corresponding measure. The reappointment of March to the Federal Trade Commission surprised many people; yet the President acted on the urging of one of the liberal Senators. In the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, presided over by Jesse H. Jones of Texas, a man who does not sufficiently share the President's underlying purpose in financial matters, recent appointments have also fallen short of the mark.

In the course of the next congressional session and of an election year, the long-term effect of selections for large administrative posts is likely to be obscured, as was the case also in the heat of the session recently completed. Informed and appreciative public opinion can therefore be especially useful at this time: useful, first, in supporting the President's recognition of the fact that without the right men to administer legislative reforms, new laws may be in vain and their failure may promote reaction; useful, second, in supporting, against political and Wall Street pressures, the President's preference for able administrators rather than great names, and for commissioners who see the danger of high finance, rather than those subject or likely to become subject to its influence.

A Punctured Balloon Descends

THE ACTION of the New Haven Railroad in applying for bankruptcy has served to underline an important development that came a few days earlier. The Interstate Commerce Commission, contrary to the wishes of Jesse H. Jones of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, denied the request of the New Haven for an additional loan from the government. This is both sound administration and sound finance.

Congress required that before any further loans were made to railroads, other than for maintenance or purchase of equipment, the Commission must certify that the prospective borrowers were not in need of reorganization. The Commission was unable to make such a finding about the New Haven. In the past, efforts have been made to get around similar requirements of law by advancing the argument that public confidence might be impaired if important railroads went into bankruptcy (and the New Haven is one of the big ones, however malodorous its financial past). The administrative authorities, faced with this dilemma, have only one sound answer, though not even the Interstate Commerce Commission has always realized this. If danger to public confidence is to be a factor of importance, either Congress should issue to the administrative officials express direction to this effect, or it should repeal its express requirements, which deprive the Commission of any discretion to let the members' opinions about public confidence govern their decisions.

Mr. Jones is the type of official who inclines to let his own views of what is expedient override the policy of Congress, a policy gradually built up since the creation of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation more than three and one-half years ago. The I.C.C., in the present instance, has followed the same courageous dictates that led it to make, during the last decade, its wise decision refusing to countenance the pyramiding plans of the Van Sweringens —a decision that would have saved the investing public millions of dollars and the country much grief if the Van Sweringen lawyers had not then found a way to act in disregard of the Commission.

The I.C.C. is now entitled to the same praise that greeted its Van Sweringen decision. It deserves special recognition because it was opposed by strong and resourceful groups both within and outside the government, groups ready to blame the Commission for any untoward events in the stock market or elsewhere in the world of high finance. The Commission can always meet the argument that it is causing temporary inconvenience by pointing, not alone to the statutory requirements, but also to the experience of recent years. The policy of temporizing instead of dealing promptly with the necessity for thorough reorganization of many of our railroad financial structures has only postponed the evil day, made things worse and inflicted on investors a heavier loss than they would have had if large additional government loans had not been made in the depression period of "Pollyanna finance." It is to be hoped that the Commission will show increasing firmness in dealing with all matters of railroad finance and reorganization, and that the influence of the Jones group in the government will continue to wane until it is finally eliminated.

THE NEW REPUBLIC

PUBLISHED WEEKLY AND COPYRIGHT, 1935, IN THE U. S., BY THE NEW REPUBLIC, INC., 40 EAST 49TH STREET, NEW YORK CITY. BRUCE BLIVEN, PRESIDENT, DANIEL MEBANE, TREASURER.

EDITORS

BRUCE BLIVEN MALCOLM COWLEY R. M. LOVETT
GEORGE SOULE STARK YOUNG

CONTRIBUTING EDITORS

HAMILTON BASSO H. N. BRAILSFORD JOHN DEWEY
JOHN T. FLYNN WALDO FRANK E. C. LINDEMAN
W. P. MANGOLD R. G. TUGWELL LEWIS MUMFORD
JONATHAN MITCHELL

RATES: SINGLE COPIES, FIFTEEN CENTS; YEARLY SUBSCRIPTION, FIVE DOLLARS; CANADIAN, FIVE DOLLARS AND FIFTY CENTS; FOREIGN, SIX DOLLARS; THREE MONTHS' TRIAL, ONE DOLLAR.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

They Cry "Peace, Peace"

II: *The Difficult Road Away from War*

IN AN earlier article in The New Republic ("The Plight of the Pacifists," issue of October 23) I discussed the sad state of the pacifist movement in this country at the present time. I pointed out that the most fanatical supporters of the League must now recognize that that body does not have and has never had any power to prevent war except in the direction and to the extent that peace was desired by two or three of the Great Powers with whose national policies a pacifist attitude happened to coincide. Thus the timid and dilatory efforts to exert pressure on Italy at the moment result primarily from the fact that Great Britain regarded Mussolini's plans as a direct threat to her empire and was willing to pay the French a heavy price for support of League sanctions. These sanctions, however, have been confined, by French insistence, to restrictions Mussolini was prepared to accept for a period of sixty or ninety days, at the end of which time he can announce the triumphant close of the war and can get from Ethiopia a little more, in the form of territory and concessions, than he was offered before the shooting began. Even this pretty peace plan is subject to the risk of an "incident" in the Mediterranean that may precipitate a genuine European conflict.

While the League in the past fifteen years has averted a few minor wars, for the reasons stated above it has not been able to halt the Japanese advance in Asia, nor is it likely to do so in the future. It was not able to stop the war in the Gran Chaco. It has not been able to prevent the rearming of Germany, whose obvious purpose is eventual war with France or Russia or both. The League is a chain that is no stronger than its strongest links; and there is no real intention to use this chain as a set of handcuffs for Mars.

Public discussion of the factors making, in the long run, for war, has now advanced to the point where practically all serious students of the subject agree that the primary causes are economic, though these causes may assume one or another of many Protean forms. We are therefore beginning to hear from such distinguished authorities as Mr. Frank Simonds and Sir Samuel Hoare that what the world needs is a redistribution of colonial territory, to adjust the balance between the hungry and the sated nations. It is part of this general proposal that the world's raw materials should also be allocated among the nations on a basis of need. But surely no man in his senses imagines that the existing government of any of the Great Powers would consent to either of these courses, or would be permitted by existing public opinion at home to do so. One has only to reduce this pretty generality to concrete terms to see how absurd it is. Would the British give Hongkong to Japan, or the French, Indo-China? Would France care to hand over the Syrian mandate to Italy, or Britain surrender Egypt to Il Duce? Which of the Great Powers is prepared to give vast quantities of iron, coal or oil to a nation that is likely to employ these materials in some future war against the donor? It is safe to say that the international conference which attempted to carry out these policies would be the immediate prelude to a new general conflict.

The underlying weakness in these grandiose schemes is that they presuppose the continuance of private capitalistic enterprise in all those countries where it now exists; and that such enterprise presupposes the continuance of large and expanding foreign trade. To be sure, there is now an important counter-current in the world: the movement toward economic self-sufficiency, toward "autarchy," which seeks to make the nation economically independent to the highest possible degree, to balance imports and exports on a physical basis, reducing them virtually to barter. If this movement could be carried to its logical conclusion throughout the world, it could do much to alleviate the war danger. Unfortunately, however, this will not happen. Autarchy is not a policy deliberately pursued by the nations for the sake of peace. It has been forced upon certain countries by necessity, the necessity of stopping the flight of capital, of protecting the national gold supply, of preventing currency depreciation. While it has aimed heavy blows at private capitalistic enterprise, these have been the blows of a friend seeking, let us say, to knock drowning capitalism unconscious and drag it to shore. In Germany, where this process has gone farthest, there has not appeared the slightest renunciation of imperialist ambition. On the contrary, German autarchy has been in large degree part of the preparation for a war that would conquer vast new territories for the Reich.

To simplify and condense a complicated historical process in a summary that is not unfair, no matter how much it may outrage the historians: The coming of the factory system, enormously increasing the productive power of each individual, might have been used to enrich all mankind. Instead, through nobody's fault in particular but because that was the line of least resistance, it resulted in a tremendous increase in the population of the industrialized

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

countries with, probably, some slight raising of the standard of living of the whole number of people and a great increase in wealth for a limited few. An important part of the process from its beginning has been the creation of an "exportable surplus" through the production of goods either in excess of the domestic demand or in excess of the domestic purchasing power. As the industrial revolution has run its course, this exportable surplus, exchanged for raw materials, services or handicraft objects from abroad or for investments overseas, has tended to grow larger, while the area for consumption of such goods in the formerly "backward" parts of the world has steadily been reduced as these countries were themselves industrialized.

In other words, the great manufacturing nations must compete harder and harder in dwindling markets to dispose of goods of which, under "free capitalist activity," there are larger and larger surpluses. Such competition played an important part, though certainly not the only part, in bringing about the Great War. It has played a part in the international tension that has gone on ever since and is steadily mounting.

There is only one way to relieve this international tension, to bring the situation under control and thus to do away permanently with the greatest single cause of war. The formula is obvious: we must not only allocate colonies and raw materials, as so many people are nowadays lightly suggesting, but we must allocate foreign trade as well. We must tell each of the exporting nations how much it shall send abroad and where and what. This may sound simple, but in fact it is the most revolutionary proposal that anyone can make. The links in the logical chain are inexorable. First of all, the nations must be willing to delegate to some international authority control over their vital economic processes. Second, in order to avoid calamitous overproduction, the quantities of goods produced for the domestic market must be limited just as sharply as are those for export, since the manufacturer who is too optimistic regarding the quantities he can sell at home can no longer hide his mistakes by dumping his surplus abroad.

Once you have limited production, you must also limit maximum hours and minimum wages of all labor. It is the law of private capitalism to seek the greatest possible profit; if quantities are fixed in advance, profit can come only by forcing the worker to toil harder, for less money. If this process were allowed to continue unchecked, we should speedily have a slave state. Therefore government, assuming that it is to represent the interest of the whole community and not that of a small owning class, must step in to protect both this generation and the next.

I hardly need to point out that when you have set the total annual production for every factory and farm, when you have specified wages and hours, you have also set, broadly speaking, interest on investment and profits. While here and there some enterpriser, through inventive ingenuity or shrewd study of the market, might gain a temporary advantage, in general the capitalist's return would tend to shrink to a modest banking rate of interest. Foreign trade would, in its essentials, be on a barter basis, each country exchanging with every other country only those goods and services that it genuinely needed and only in the amounts it could actually absorb. This would not, of course, necessarily mean less foreign trade than we have today. It might even mean an increase; we should probably be spared such spectacles as the Germans substituting rhubarb for lemons in order to protect their currency, or the Russians drinking imitation coffee because they need their foreign credits with which to import the machines of heavy industry. When the steps outlined above had been accomplished, we should have gone a long way in the direction of a completely socialized, sane and orderly economy throughout the world. Thereafter we should certainly go farther still.

I am well aware that the formula I have given is one that will receive the most violent opposition in many quarters. While our notions of rugged individualism have altered a good deal in the past few years, during which most of our generalissimos of industry have gone begging to Washington, cap in hand, it still seems intolerable to many persons that a business man should not be allowed to run his affairs in his own way, and sell what he can, wherever he can. The answer to this is that if enough people in enough countries continue to hold this view, we shall go on having a series of disastrous wars, until our civilization is liquidated, as has happened before in the world's history.

No doubt many American pacifists would at this point remark that my counsels were those of despair. If, they would say, the only basis for permanent peace is a socialist or semi-socialist state, we might as well abandon all hope. Such a thing is far in the future, if indeed it is ever to be attained at all. Before it can be achieved, we shall have a fascist regime even in those countries which have thus far escaped that affliction, and the dying agonies of imperialist capitalism will wreck us all.

It is certainly possible that this dire prediction will be fulfilled, and I offer no guarantee that it will not. On the other hand, there are some reasons for taking a rather less hopeless view. The first of these is that fascism does not solve and cannot solve the economic dilemma that has been the chief factor in calling it into existence. It is true that in Italy and Germany, the fascist dictatorships have put certain restrictions on capitalism and particularly in the export industries. But as I have already suggested, these restrictions have not looked in the direction of solving the fundamental problem. To change my metaphor, they have put our social system in prison (a light sentence) instead of sending it to the hospital for a cancer operation. Faced with dwindling markets and a declining standard of living at home, the fascists' only answer is to cut

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

off foreign trade almost entirely and to seek to lower the capitalists' cost of operation by cutting the wages of those who are simultaneously their employees and their customers. Even a king of the art of public hypnosis like Hitler or Mussolini comes to a day when the mass hysteria he has produced no longer outweighs the pain of empty bellies. When that day comes the dictator will disappear and there is at least a chance that his successor will be able to work along lines that contain a better hope for the future of mankind.

What is true of the dictator-ridden countries is also true of those which still have political—but not economic—democracy, like Great Britain and the United States. While it is obvious that those who control the existing governments in these two countries have no intention of overturning the system of private capitalism, it is also true that in both countries laissez-faire is a thing of the past. Capitalist enterprise is being subjected to numerous restrictions. These are important, not in themselves but as portents of what is coming. They have started an educative process among the people that is developing a momentum of its own. Neither the Roosevelt administration nor the British Tories would voluntarily make changes in the economic organization of the country so drastic as the ones described above; but both these governments can, and do, create situations making it possible for them to be succeeded by governments prepared to go the whole way.

What chance is there that governments of this character will come into control in a sufficiently large number of the leading countries of the world within, say, the next ten years? Space does not permit me to discuss the position in each country at length; but a few outstanding facts can be mentioned. First, the largest country in the world, in land area, and the third largest in population, Soviet Russia, has already destroyed in her people the economic motive for war. It is true that she has a huge army and is spending large sums on armament; but her intentions are peaceful as are those of no other Great Power on earth. She is under imminent threat of attack, from imperialistic motives, by two powerful Fascist nations, in the East and West; only a few years ago she was repeatedly invaded at several points by expeditions jointly financed and equipped by a coalition of other imperialist countries. No wonder she fears war and is even willing to throw herself into the European network of alliances in order to lessen the danger.

Left to herself, however, Soviet Russia is no threat to any other power. She has no exportable surplus because actually, though not technically, she produces for use and not for profit. When she exports it is only the minimum necessary to make possible badly needed imports. Even her erstwhile ambition to help the cause of communist revolution in other countries has now been changed into the determination to set an irresistible example of socialist success.

In France, a government far enough to the Left to clip the claws of private capitalism is by no means a Utopian dream. It is quite possible that the Socialist-Communist forces of the People's Front may come into power within the next six months.

In England, we have seen two Labor governments in the past twelve years. It is true that both of them were bitterly disappointing in that the leaders of the Labor Party, and particularly Mr. Ramsay Macdonald, failed to carry out the fundamentally radical policies on which that party had built its strength through a generation. While the Tories will win the election to be held late this month, the forces on the Left are growing, are becoming steadily more self-conscious and disciplined, and are unlikely to be tricked again. A Labor government in all important respects paralleling the People's Front in France and prepared to strike hands with that group is far from impossible in the next few years.

As to Germany and Italy, one cannot make intelligent prediction at the present time. We know, however, that despite the iron suppression of all Left movements and the censorship which cloaks that suppression, there are strong radical movements in both countries, and particularly in Germany, where the bitter lesson of weakness through disunion among those who ought to be allies has now been learned. Many competent observers who cannot be accused of wishful thinking believe that in both these countries the fascist governments are nearing the end of their course. If so, the forces on the Left are more likely to succeed them than any other group.

The United States is the laggard among the nations in this regard, something easy to understand if you believe, as I do, that we recapitulate the history of Europe with a lag of fifteen to thirty years. But even in the United States, some progress is being made. Twenty years ago, every pacifist was automatically written down as guilty of personal cowardice; today, if the tests of public opinion recently made are accurate, a majority of the coming generation is opposed to any war except in self-defense and an impressive minority will resist even that. If we look back even fifteen years, the degree of public education as to the causes of war has been extraordinary. The isolationist sentiment that is so strong in the Middle and Far West in particular, and that dominates Congress today, while it is partly irrational, instinctive and deluded, is also in part founded on an understanding of realities that is entitled to the respect of the radicals in any European country.

Do all these facts add up into the basis for a practicable program for American pacifists? What should be their attitude in the immediate world crisis centering around the Italo-Ethiopian affair? Is there any likelihood that the peace movement in this country will go so far as the argument given above demands? I shall attempt to answer these questions in a subsequent article.

BRUCE BLIVEN.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The Press Goes to War

I: What France Reads

IT IS no exaggeration to say that this past summer will rank as one of the most disgraceful episodes in the history of French newspapers. There are exceptions, of course. The press of the Left behaved fairly decently—though, suffering from the Hitler-persecution complex, even one of the best papers of the Left considered at one time the possibility of legalizing the Ethiopian war under Article 15, paragraph 7, of the Covenant. This alone shows to what extent French opinion as a whole was, and perhaps still is (though in a different way), reluctant to strengthen Germany by quarreling with Italy. There are some other exceptions. "Pertinax," for instance, soon discovered that France could not drop for Italy's sake all the principles of collective security embodied in the League Covenant. But the majority of the press?

Arthur Raffalovitch, the financial agent of the Tsarist government, whose job it was to "push" Russian loans in France, once spoke of "the abominable venality of the French press." Today I can just see Signor X groaning in the same way over this "abominable venality." The payments are, naturally, made in cash, and this venality is, indeed, one of the few commodities that Italy makes no attempt to get on credit. Unfortunately, this makes it difficult to say how much exactly this paper or that paper got, though in certain diplomatic quarters, where a great deal is known about such transactions, it is estimated that in the past months Italy has spent on her press campaign in France between fifty and one hundred million francs. When I say that she has paid for it all in cash, it does not mean that the cash came straight from Rome and was not borrowed in Paris. It is not inconceivable that part of the money that Marshal Balbo is understood to have borrowed for armaments from a leading French bank in August went to pay newspaper proprietors and journalists—or rather *journalistes* (*sic*), as La Fouchardière calls this special brand of newspapermen.

The Italian press propaganda in France took various forms and was calculated to impress every kind of public. The anti-parliamentary bourgeoisie was treated to extravagant glorifications of Mussolini; the rather more skeptical public was provided with lurid stories and pictures of Ethiopian atrocities ("you may dislike Mussolini, but, after all, there's a lot to be said," etc., etc.) and with suggestions that Ethiopia should be expelled from the League. England's doubtful loyalty to the League and her imperialist motives were conclusively demonstrated; further, the scare that Mussolini would form an alliance with Hitler was exploited to the utmost; and, in connection with this, there came the most interesting story of all—namely, that France would be mad to abandon the friendship of Italy merely for the friendship of England, for not only was this friendship unreliable (as if Italy's friendship were more reliable), but the British air force was practically non-existent, and the British navy was obsolete and inefficient, and would not stand a dog's chance against the Italian air force and against those magnificent new Italian submarines and 35,000-ton battleships. (The fact that these battleships are nowhere near completion was, of course, overlooked.) And as for being an eventual ally against Germany, England was as good as useless.

This propaganda was particularly stupid. For whatever the average Frenchman may think of Ethiopian atrocities, it will take a lot to persuade him that Italy can ever be a more powerful ally than England. It did the Italians more harm than good—for propaganda that is too obvious defeats its own end—at least in an intelligent country like France; and by the time the Paris negotiations broke down and the Council met again, the overwhelming majority of French opinion had decided, though not always without hesitation, in favor of England and the League Covenant and against "the Italian alliance at any price." It is this evolution in French public opinion that provides the background for Laval's "surprisingly satisfactory" speech before the Assembly. Only, when one considers that France's defense of the League Covenant was "surprising," one cannot help feeling that there was something very wrong with French foreign policy for a good long time before.

The pro-Italian press had its last big splash when the Italians published their more or less faked photographs of Ethiopian atrocities; but since the collapse of the Rickett affair, since Laval's belated speech, and since the increasingly irritating behavior of the Italians at Geneva, the pro-Italian propaganda has become more and more difficult. The scandalous attempts to rouse popular indignation over Professor Jèze have fallen completely flat, and I am told on very good authority that Le Petit Bonjour informed its Italian paymaster the other day that it would have to raise the space rate on Italian propaganda in view of the increasing difficulty of defending so unpopular a cause! What is rather serious in all this disgraceful business is that it is not simply a question of Italian subsidies to the corrupt French papers. The matter is a little more complicated than that. The Italian government has numerous powerful accomplices in France. The financial oligarchy, which has a great deal to do

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

with the press, is predominantly Fascist or, at any rate, anti-democratic. I have even heard it said in left-wing quarters that Laval is, whether willingly or unwillingly, under the influence—or pressure—of the financial oligarchy-Croix de Feu forces, and that even his climb-down at Geneva, which was forced upon him by public opinion and M. Herriot, was more apparent than real.

Paris. ALEXANDER WERTH.

II: The Italian Press, New York

THE FIRST few weeks of the Italo-Ethiopian war, and particularly the Geneva discussions accompanying that conflict, have been reflected in an extraordinary manner in the Italian Fascist press in this country. A certain amount of censorship from Rome is of course to be expected. It is also natural that newspapers owned and edited by so complete a Fascist as Signor Generoso Pope should print as God-derived and indisputable truth the ideology of "Young Italy." However, the journalistic tricks used in the determination to twist all news into support of that ideology are somewhat surprising, particularly when one remembers that Fascist editors in this country, unlike their comrades in Italy, are embarrassed by access to news from all parts of the world.

The methods include suppressing or only half revealing all news unfavorable to Italy; headlines and captions based on political assumptions completely unwarranted by the facts subsequently reported; back-handed reporting, that is, reporting chiefly by means of opposition protests, of undesirable news such as Roosevelt's proclamation limiting travel on the ships of belligerents or Laval's decision to back the League in the application of sanctions; substitution of endless harangues on national honor for any clear report of international developments, particularly in Geneva; and what seems to be a temperamental inability to let pass any news, no matter how slight, without pro-Italian editorial comment.

We give here a few examples of these means of deception, all taken from Pope's paper, Il Progresso Italo-Americano, the outstanding Italian Fascist daily in the United States. Signor Pope's other New York daily, Corriere d'America, gives a tabloid version of the same material. The examples deal for the most part with diplomatic moves since the outbreak of hostilities. So far the progress of the war itself has not been such as to demand much distortion in the Fascist press, except for denials that Italian troops were suffering from fevers or lack of water, exaggerations of the number of Ethiopians killed, and the constant use of ambiguous war dispatches to prove that Ethiopia and not Italy was the aggressor.

October 4: The New York Times reports that France and Great Britain have reached an agreement on the question of sanctions. Il Progresso denies that there has been any accord between Laval and Eden and prints as a headline across the top of its second most important news page: "PARIS CRIES 'DOWN WITH ENGLAND!'" This illustrates a consistent policy of calumniating England and taking advantage of the ambiguous position of France to make that country seem entirely pro-Italian.

Il Progresso prints in large-type headlines: "GERMANY PROMISES TO HELP ITALY IN CASE OF SANCTIONS." This is purely an assumption, and the body of the article shows it to be untrue. The article reports a visit of the German Ambassador in Rome to Mussolini during which "the *possibility* of Germany's helping Italy in case of sanctions was *discussed*." (Italics mine.)

October 7: According to The New York Times Geneva dispatch of this date, the Council Committee of Six had completed its report putting blame on the Italian government. Above Il Progresso's Geneva news we find the headline: "EVEN THE COMMITTEE OF SIX DOES NOT NAME ITALY RESPONSIBLE FOR AGGRESSION." Toward the end of the dispatch it is admitted that the rebuke is probable in the near future.

President Roosevelt's proclamation designed to limit travel on ships of belligerents receives, in Il Progresso, a negligible back-page notice in which it is called "a mere formality." Apparently it changed overnight from being a mere formality to a matter for international concern, for on October 8 protests against this proclamation from the Conference on Port Development receive front-page headlines. In this issue of the paper and throughout the week the arguments of the Conference are related in full, but nowhere except in these protests is the proclamation itself quoted.

October 11: The New York Times reports that fifty-one nations have condemned Italy. Il Progresso's Geneva news consists of statements to the effect that the report of the Council has been approved. In none of the captions is the verdict mentioned. Most prominent in the article are comments on the positions of Austria and Hungary and insulting editorial remarks about the Ethiopian delegate.

Such methods of propaganda are corroborated by monotonous repetitions of the Italian thesis, with all its contradictions (Ethiopia was the aggressor, the Italian campaign is purely defensive, it is Italy's divine right to find a place for her surplus population, etc.), undiscriminating reprints of pro-Italian articles, on no matter what journalistic level, and long, entirely unfactual dispatches from Rome describing the frenzied joy of mothers watching their sons go to war for the greater glory of Italy. More subtle perhaps, though equally monotonous, is the injection of editorializing into foreign news, of which the insistence on France's friendship for Italy, in spite of her approval of sanctions, is the most inspired. We quote two instances:

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

October 2: "PARIS HOSTILE TO ENGLISH DEMANDS." There is nothing in the article to prove the hostility.

October 3: "FRANCE GIVES ASSURANCES TO ITALY." With some amazement we find that the only item of news value in the article is that France has decided on sanctions against Italy.

Needless to say, there is no representation of any attitude other than the Italian. Actions and statements of other governments are "clarified" by means of eulogy or slander, often consisting of an adolescent type of mud-throwing. In Il Progresso for October 7, for instance, we find the effectiveness of the British government minimized by reference to the "mentality" of the English. The press in Italy has for a long time consisted almost exclusively of such material, but it is particularly interesting to find that patriotism can lead to the repetition of this blindfold, hysterical formula in a country where news is more or less available and impartial reporting is not punishable by a trip to the Island of Lipari. Nor is it any compliment to Italian Fascism that powerful representatives of our own press are equally dedicated to force and falsification.

ELEANOR CLARK.

America and the Olympics

AMERICAN participation in the eleventh Olympic Games to be held next year in Berlin has become a bitterly controversial matter. The champions of non-participation have been increasingly active during the past months. The Anti-Nazi Federation has collected 30,000 protest signatures. A widely representative group has formed the Committee on Fair Play in Sports. Influential individuals such as Governor Earle of Pennsylvania, New York Supreme Court Justice Pecora, Samuel Untermeyer, Heywood Broun, New York Representative Emanuel Cellar and organizations like the National Council of Methodist Youth, the American Youth Congress, the Catholic War Veterans have warmed up for the battle. Nevertheless authority for final action rests entirely with the sports-minded American Olympic Committee, whose answer is that three teams for the Winter Olympics of February have already been chosen and are booked to sail on the S.S. "Manhattan" on January 3.

Aside from the question of American approval of the Hitler regime, the fact remains that the only legitimate excuse the American Olympic Committee can make for withdrawal is a proved violation by Germany of its Olympic pledge to give equal opportunity for participation in the Games to all athletes, no matter of what country, race, color or creed. Because of censorship, news from Germany is difficult to confirm, but the following items have been authentically proved and illuminate the position of Germany in regard to the spirit and practice of the Olympic Games.

In the first place it is obvious that Germany's team will be a political one. German sports are controlled by the government under the Sport Commissar, Hans von Tschammer-Osten, an appointee of Hitler responsible for all Olympic arrangements. Without issuing a direct edict against Jewish athletes, von Tschammer-Osten first ordered all Nazi athletic groups to bar Jews, and then coordinated every branch of sport into the Reich Association for Physical Culture by requiring every Aryan organization to belong. Unless affiliated with Nazi clubs, Catholics and Protestants are not allowed to engage in sport. Through these Aryan groups under the direction of von Tschammer-Osten the training of athletes for the Olympic Games is being conducted as a direct function of the German government, an unprecedented violation of the democratic and independent status of world sports and one that makes Jewish training or qualification impossible.

Last year Bruno Malitz, sports leader of the Berlin Storm Troopers, published a book entitled "The Spirit of Sports in the Third Reich," distributed gratis to every athletic organization. Malitz writes: "We must never forget that our sports are built upon hatred. . . . Jewish leaders of sports, Jewish athletes, and their Talmud-infested friends the pacifists, political Catholics, pan-Europeans and the like, have no place in our German land. They are worse than cholera and syphilis, and much worse than famine, drought and poison gas." Furthermore, he remarks that Nazis "can see no positive value in permitting dirty Jews and Negroes to travel through our country and compete in athletics with our best."

On August 9, 1935, when asked why there were no Jews among the 230 German athletes in the sixth international university games at Budapest, George Fischer, manager of the German team, explained that "non-Aryans in Germany do not possess the Aryan competitive spirit."

On August 6, 1935, all sport clubs in Germany were ordered to set aside the month of September for discussion of anti-Semitism. On September 25, Dr. Goebbels' paper, Der Angriff, stated in connection with preparations for the Olympic Games that "no arrangements for the housing of visitors and Olympic teams will be made in the homes of Jews." Over the entrance to Garmisch-Partenkirchen, site of the Winter Olympics, a sign was placed proclaim-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ing: "Jews not admitted." A photograph exists to prove this.

The psychological difficulties of competing under conditions of hatred are well represented in the case of Mary Friewald, Polish champion hurdler, who was shouted at and spit at by a Dresden mob when it was revealed that she was a Jewess.

No Protestant or Catholic can train or compete for the Olympic Games unless he or she is a member of a Nazi-controlled athletic organization. Repeatedly Catholic youth groups have been prohibited from engaging in any sports of their own sponsoring; this is now held an offense against the state. Last July the Catholic sports organization, Deutsche Jugendkraft, was officially dissolved although it had been assured sanction by the Vatican Concordat of 1933. Its property was confiscated for the alleged reason of hostility toward the state. Exactly a year before, Adelbert Probst, head of the Deutsche Jugendkraft, was killed by Storm Troopers.

As for discrimination against the Negro, Julius Streicher prevented a scheduled match in Nuremberg last March between the Negro wrestler Wango and a German. "It degrades our race," he said, "to permit a Negro wrestler to fight a white man. He who applauds when a black man throws a white is not worthy of Nuremberg or German citizenship."

Despite the natural apprehension that such facts must arouse in the minds of Jewish, Catholic and Negro athletes, some of whom will surely represent the United States, the American Olympic Committee reiterates its stand that participation in the Games does not mean endorsement of the Nazis and that American athletes will not be sacrificed for the promotion of a "misguided" boycott of Germany.

Of the forty-nine nations, including the United States, that have accepted the invitation to participate, Holland is the only country so far to withdraw, ostensibly for lack of financial support of the teams, although the Haagsche Post of The Hague editorialized against holding an Olympiad in a country "filled with the Streicher spirit." Although Mr. Avery Brundage, president of the American Olympic Committee, says that the United States is the only country that has raised any issue about participation, it is definitely known that organizations in Spain, Belgium, Norway, Denmark and Sweden have promoted movements for withdrawal.

In the Winter Olympics, held from February 6 to 16 at Garmisch-Partenkirchen, the United States will be represented by sixty-six competitors in speed skating, figure skating, hockey, bobsled and skiing, three teams of which are already elected. For the summer Olympics, present plans provide for a team of 411 men and women. Money for the winter sports has already been raised. The fund campaign for the summer events never begins until March before the August competition. "It should be remembered," Mr. Brundage says, that "no tryouts anywhere in the world, including Germany, have been or will be held for the main events of August until early next summer." Despite anti-Nazi propaganda it will be a simple matter to make up a full team from those anxious to compete in Berlin. The majority of American athletes want to compete, although many of them are likely to be Catholics, and Jews and Negroes are certain to be included.

Despite the vigorous pleas of Judge Jeremiah Mahoney, president of the Amateur Athletic Union, the Olympic Committee contends that he won't get to first base with his boycotting at the December 5 convention of the Union. Of the thirty-four associations in the A.A.U. only four are officially known to be opposed, although a poll conducted by The New York Daily Mirror claimed that nine favored withdrawal. The sentiment remains divided and the controversial sparring goes on. But the American Olympic Committee happens to be referee as well as protagonist. Its judgment stands firm: America will go to the Olympics in Berlin. Even so they have found it wise to prepare a counter-propaganda campaign, soon to be launched, which will involve addresses by Lowell Thomas and other influential public-address artists. JAMES BROUGHTON.

Bon Voyage

THE DAY they took Andrew Britt to San Quentin, I had my car parked at the automobile ferry at six o'clock in the morning so that I wouldn't miss anything in case they decided to take him over on the early boat. Jim Goodman, the cameraman I had with me, took a long nap, his neck bent back over the top of the seat, but I was too cold to sleep and so I got a pad and wrote my story. I already knew what I was supposed to say and I wrote it off fast:

> Andrew Britt, convicted last Thursday of the brutal hammer-murder of his pretty bride of two months while vacationing at their El Norte "Love Cote," took his last trip today. At —— o'clock, accompanied by Sheriff William T. Tanner, a deputy, and —— officers, the handsome young killer boarded the San Rafael ferry. He was wearing a natty —— suit and gay tie and was willing to joke with reporters, but despite his forced gayety his face revealed the nervous tension under which he had been for the six weeks of his sensational trial.

The story went on that way and ended with an account of the murder and the high-lights of the trial. It took me about half an hour to write it. When I had it done I was moving about trying to find a warmer way to sit and I bumped against Jim and woke him up. He jerked up and said, "They are here?"

"No," I said. "They probably won't be here until the ten o'clock boat. We should have taken a chance. Go back to sleep. I'm sorry."

"I'm all right now," Jim said. "If I can just get an hour or two in around daybreak I'm all right.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

But it doesn't matter if I go to bed at nine o'clock, if I have to get up before daybreak I'm no good all day. It makes me sort of sick somehow. That's why I never liked fishing."

He stretched, lighted his pipe, and settled himself for conversation. "Why didn't you get some sleep? Do you have to be in bed?"

"I got my day's work done," I said, "while you slept. You want to see it?"

"Why should I want to see it? I ought to know what your stuff is like by now."

But he took the pad and glanced through the story. When he handed it back to me he said:

"You guys think you're pretty bright, writing things up before they happen. Now take my job, you got to have something there before you can get a picture of it."

Jim Goodman is not subtle, but I took this for adverse criticism.

"In my job," I said, "it's better not to see too much. The only kind of accuracy the boss cares about is the details that don't mean anything. That's why I write 'hmmp o'clock' and 'attired in a natty hmmp-colored suit.' I supply the accuracy after I've seen Britt and know what kind of suit he's got on and which ferry he took. That's as far as I'm allowed to go in seeing things for myself. As far as the rest of it goes, you know just what they want you to say, and there's no sense in waiting until you're back at the office to say it. You might as well write it out before and get off early."

"Take it easy," said Jim. "Your story's all right."

"I do this for money. I write what they tell me to, and they give me a check for it every two weeks, see how it is?"

"Don't go to pieces," said Jim. "I didn't mean to start anything. I just wanted to talk about something."

"It's nice you happened to hit on a subject I can talk about," I said. "I'll tell you something. I reported the Britt case all the way through, and from the start I had a feeling the fellow was innocent. Something about Britt's face and manner made me know that he wouldn't bash his wife's head in, then throw her down the cellar steps and act surprised when he found her dead. And during the first days of the trial the poor guy looked so sad and bewildered that I knew as well as I know anything that it wasn't put on. There wasn't any murder committed, but Lodo County wanted a good murder trial and Britt was the only one handy to hang it onto. In Lodo County they love a murder trial."

"What's your kick? They treated us swell, didn't they?"

"Keep still," I said. "I'm trying to tell you something. I stressed the accident theory in all my first stories because that was the only thing that seemed at all logical. Then I got a wire from the boss to come back to the city and see him. All he wanted to talk to me about was the matter of sales. He said that the trial had brought up the sales of every other paper in the city except ours, and he just wanted to talk to me about it. He did get around to saying before I left that it doesn't sell papers if a woman slips, falls down the steps and cracks her skull, and that the other papers weren't paying any attention to that phase of it. When you've got the possibility of murder like the Britt thing, he said, you can't be squeamish about it."

I turned and looked at Jim. He had knocked the ashes out of his pipe and was filling it again. "Why should you get so worked up about it?" he said. "What's real is that they convicted him and they're going to hang him in one of your natty black hoods. And Prosecutor Harnfeld will get to be a judge, and that's justice."

"But as far as I could see," I said, "they didn't prove a thing against him. They didn't even seem to try. All Harnfeld did was wave that bloody sweater at the jury."

Jim only grunted.

The nine o'clock ferry came in. Five or six cars drove off, and Jim and I were still the only ones waiting to make the return trip. The early morning bleakness was gone and the day had become warm and clear. The bay was hard navy blue under the sun and the seagulls looked very white against it. Jim and I got out of the car, walked to the edge of the dock, and stood leaning against the railing looking at the bay. I felt warm and more peaceful. Jim said:

"I wouldn't care if we had to wait until noon. This is like spring in the East. I've never seen it just this way out here; it's always either too hot or the sun doesn't shine at all."

We stood there. The ferry was about to go back across the bay, the chain was up and the engines started, when we heard a police siren start low, rise, and hold its highest pitch. At the sound of authority the engine of the boat slowed down, a deck-hand let down the chain that would bar admission and everything waited for the car that was speeding to the end of the dock.

"Here they are," I said. "Let's be going."

The police car was powdered with the yellow dust I had come to know in Lodo County. It looked as if they had been driving fast just for the excitement of the thing. There were two cars behind the police car. I pulled in behind them and made the fourth car on the boat. A uniformed policeman was driving the first car and Britt was sitting between him and Sheriff Tanner on the front seat. The other two cars were press cars; I recognized Jack Hurd of The Telegram and Arthur Carper of The Dispatch. Each of them had a cameraman with him.

Jack Hurd got out of his car and came back to talk to us.

"They're saying in town," he said, "that the foreman of the Britt jury is Harnfeld's first cousin."

"Fine," I said. "That should get him a new trial. Have they done anything about it yet?"

"I don't suppose they will," Hurd said. "The thing's washed up as far as everybody's concerned. It wouldn't do Britt any good if he did get a new

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

trial. Harnfeld's got a lot of relatives. I just thought you'd like to know because you seemed to like Britt in your first stories."

"Thanks," I said. "Thank you a lot."

Jim laughed after Hurd had gone away. "Somebody always says that when a guy gets convicted," he said.

"It would explain how they got a conviction without proving a thing against him," I said. "It certainly would do that. Get your camera and let's take a picture."

Britt, Sheriff Tanner, a policeman and the newspapermen were out of their cars standing by the rail talking. As Jim and I came up to them Arthur Carper said to Britt:

"Would you give us a picture of yourself handcuffed to the sheriff?"

"Certainly," said Britt. "Anything at all."

"You'd better get that too," I said to Jim.

"And now will you answer a few questions?" Hurd said.

"I think I've answered all of those already," he said.

His voice was low and sounded tired and lifeless. He was a mild, gentle sort of fellow, and today as during the trial his face was sad and bewildered.

"Won't you give us any statement at all?" Arthur Carper said in a wheedling sort of voice.

Britt sighed, waited a moment, and then half turned toward the rail.

"You might say I thought this was a beautiful day. You could say that the ferry ride from Richmond to San Rafael has always been one of my favorite trips."

DOROTHY BAKER.

This is the second of a group of short stories and sketches that The New Republic is publishing.—THE EDITORS.

Sonnet

When your work's done, banish it behind you,
forget its beauties and its failings both;
you've done your part by the child, borne, bred it,
given it your blood, at your heart fed it,
clothed it with care, taught it your hard-learned truth,
now that it's grown let nothing remind you
of what's forever lovely now, or marred—
no, turn to what you've still the power to guard.

Visit not often the past that bore you
not the too-friendly pleasures at your gate
not your mind's offspring married to their fate—
keep your house, the every need procure you

of those to come, your works yet to be born;
toil, plan and pray for them noon, night and morn.

ELIZABETH DARYUSH.

Washington Notes

Choosing Sides for the Election—Borah Makes Plans—Meet Messrs. Hilles, Roraback, Reed and Brown

THE BEST known liberals in the Republican Party—the La Follette brothers, Hiram W. Johnson and Senator Norris—are now publicly committed to Mr. Roosevelt. At the beginning of the New Deal, the President announced that he hoped to bring all liberals into the Democratic Party, and that it would be an excellent thing if reactionaries joined the Republicans. This realignment of political opinion seems slowly to be taking place. Many liberals are skeptical of Mr. Roosevelt's program, but, unless a third party is formed, most of them will vote for him in 1936. On the other hand, he is certain to lose the votes of thousands of conservative "Al Smith" Democrats in the big Eastern cities like New York and Boston.

Fortunately for Mr. Roosevelt's future, this realignment apparently stops short at the borders of the Solid South. The South contains more than its proportionate share of stone-age men who choke on their mint juleps or coca-colas whenever Mr. Roosevelt's name is mentioned. The popularity of the assaults on the New Deal by Virginia's two Senators, Carter Glass and Harry F. Byrd, has been so great that The Richmond Times-Dispatch recently held a poll to determine whether or not a swing toward the Republicans had begun. The result showed a slight drop from the 1932 Roosevelt vote—too slight, however, to be of practical importance. In Georgia, Governor Talmadge's philippics against the administration have been moderately successful among the country folk, although not in Atlanta and other cities, but there is no likelihood that the state will not be solidly for Mr. Roosevelt next year.

Most observers agree that the Republicans next year will be the party of extreme Toryism. Unless they desert to the Democrats, the millions of working-class voters who still call themselves Republicans and who stand at least as far to the Left as Mr. Roosevelt and the New Deal will be, in effect, disfranchised. Last spring, you will recall, rank-and-file Republicans planned a "grass roots" convention at Lincoln's home, Springfield, Illinois, for the express purpose of forcing a genuinely liberal platform upon the party's Eastern, big-business leadership. Yet, before the convention actually met, control of its committees had mysteriously passed into the hands of John D. M. Hamilton, the Kansas political prodigy, and other representatives of Eastern conservatism. No vestige of revolt emerged from the Springfield convention. Working silently, the Easterners have burked each of the succeeding "grass roots" meetings, down to the Rocky Mountain States conference a few days ago.

Republican insurgency is represented now only by Senator Borah. From the crags of his perch in Idaho come strange stories. He is reported to have given his blessing to Dr. Townsend's pension plan, to have endorsed the unlimited coinage of silver and to have provided free merry-go-round rides for the local children. More important, it is reported that he is shortly to swoop down upon the East,

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

and, in a series of speeches, denounce the Eastern party leaders by name. Bryan did approximately this in 1912, when he snatched control of the Democratic Party from Thomas Fortune Ryan and the "Wall Street gang" and brought about the nomination of Woodrow Wilson. If Borah were temperamentally capable of associating himself with an organized movement, it is conceivable that he might lead an equally successful revolt. But Borah seems to be an unshakable personal isolationist, just as he is an unshakable isolationist in foreign affairs.

The two men whom Borah is supposed to want to denounce are Charles D. Hilles and J. Henry Roraback, National Committeemen from New York and Connecticut respectively. Hardly known except to Republican professionals, they are, after Mr. Roosevelt, perhaps the two most important politicians in the country. As an appropriate introduction to his career as party boss, Hilles was once director of a boys' reform school. He is now a great business figure, director of many corporations, among them the Otis Elevator Company, the American Smelting and Refining Company, the General Cable Corporation, the New York Life Insurance Company and the Bankers' Trust Company. Before attaining his present eminence, however, he spent many years as a sort of political errand boy to big business. In contrast, Roraback has always been a provincial magnate in his own right. A country lawyer, largely self-taught, he organized a power and light company on the Housatonic River as a young man, and has for years been undisputed ruler of Connecticut's public utilities. He is also director of many Hartford insurance companies.

Too preoccupied by their far-ranging affairs to give full time to politics, these two now permit Henry P. Fletcher to run the Republican Party in their name. From 1920 to 1928, under Harding and Coolidge, they together had the deciding voice in the conduct of the national government. When, after 1928, Hoover obstinately refused to acknowledge their overlordship, they split their power with two relatively new men, Senator David A. Reed and Hoover's Postmaster General, Walter F. Brown. Unlike Hilles and Roraback, Reed was born into the ruling caste, was trustee of Princeton University, Chevalier of the Legion of Honor and represented Pittsburgh at its most opulent. His mission was to supervise Mellon and the Treasury. Brown had been one of the lesser Ohio bosses, and now became the go-between for Hilles and Roraback with the White House. Brown has since become chairman of the Hudson and Manhattan Railroad—founded, incidentally, by William G. McAdoo—and remains a power in the party.

Unless Borah or some new champion can overthrow them, Hilles, Roraback, Reed and Brown and a few minor leaders will run the next Republican convention. Whoever is nominated will campaign on a platform they have dictated, and, if elected, will govern through a Cabinet they have chosen. None of the candidates that have yet been mentioned, Frank Knox, Alf M. Landon, Senator Vandenberg, has sufficient popular strength to enable him to defy them, or to be anything but a prisoner in the White House. It is a pity that Hilles and Roraback cannot run jointly, in Siamese-twin fashion, for the presidency, so that people voting the Republican ticket can know exactly whom they are voting for.

Washington. T. R. B.

Other People's Money

Less Sugar for the Reorganization Bar Flies—Keep Neutrality Mandatory—Horse Sense in the I. C. C.

A FEDERAL judge—a wise young judge!—has just scotched an attempted raid on the assets of a bankrupt corporation—the Paramount-Publix. It is enough to make a man shed tears to see what has been done to the bills of some of those gentlemen who make up what is generally known as the reorganization bar.

There are Root, Clark, Buckner and Ballantine (Elihu Root and former Federal District Attorney Buckner); Cook, Nathan and Lehman; Davis, Polk, Wardell, Gardner and Reed (the delectable John W. Davis and the former Secretary of State Mr. Polk); Cravath, DeGersdorff, Swaine and Wood—who can be found wherever there is a sinking railroad or a wrecked corporation; and various other persons not unknown to politics, like Mr. Charles D. Hilles, the Republican leader. Everybody but Sullivan and Cromwell and Amos 'n' Andy's famous firm, Jackson, Jackson, Jackson and Jackson, was gathered around the carcass. It gives you an idea what the patriots and the defenders of liberty are doing with their time when they are not protecting the dear old Constitution.

Kuhn, Loeb, bankers, wanted $100,000. Cravath, DeGersdorff, Swaine and Wood wanted $150,000. The judge gave them a horse laugh. Mr. Vanderlip, heading a debenture holders' committee, asked $50,000 for his services. The court said nothing doing—because he had traded in the securities of the bankrupt company during the life of the committee. Several other claims were disallowed for the same reason. What! a committee chairman can't do a little trading for his own account? Ah well! here is work for the Liberty League.

The law firm of Messrs. Root and Buckner got a cut that must have pushed the patriotic urge of these lawyers up at least another half-dozen notches. They asked $700,000. The court shaved a mere $500,000 off that bill. The judge was positively cruel to Mr. John W. Davis' firm. Here was Mr. Davis himself, with civic righteousness streaming through his whole being, down in Baltimore representing a little dentist with a $400 claim against a great corporation in the interest of constitutional integrity, and working without any fee from the dentist. It is in cases like this Paramount affair that a great lawyer may recoup the losses suffered in these public services. But the judge cut his fee from $150,000 to $75,000. Altogether, the various gentlemen who worked on this corporation rehabilitation asked $3,239,828. The court sliced something more than $2,213,000 from that bill.

Sooner or later the courts, the bar associations, the legislatures and Congress will get around to the "reorganization bar." It is a fit subject for scrutiny.

Reports from Washington are to the effect that the State Department is preparing a bill to supplant the present neutrality bill—under which the President will be given discretion to apply neutrality to warring nations. At present the law is mandatory. Nothing could be more ill advised.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

If the neutrality bill has any virtue, it will arise almost entirely out of its mandatory character. If the matter is left to the judgment of the President, then inevitably two things will happen. The President will make up his mind on his course in the midst of the quarrel out of which the war grows. And that judgment will inevitably be a judgment on the quarrel itself. The President will say in one case, this is a fight with respect to which we will remain neutral. In another he will say, this is a scrap about which we are not going to be neutral. Into that judgment will go an endless collection of arguments, issues and finally conclusions, the effect of which will be to force the executive into a decision about the war and a course based on that decision which will be the very opposite of neutrality.

Applied to Italy and Ethiopia it would amount to a decision to impair Italy's fighting power. Failure to apply it to Italy would mean a determination to help her. If we are going to be neutral, let us be neutral as a matter of policy regardless of the nations that do the fighting. If the moment arrives when that policy of neutrality is abandoned, then let the decision be made by Congress—the representatives of the American people. Let us not put ourselves at the mercy of a President who can always bring us into war a little at a time by ineptness, indecision, submission to powerful trade groups.

President Roosevelt, at the last session of Congress, was in favor of inserting discretionary powers into the law. He will probably support his State Department in that when it is offered again. The pressure for it comes from those groups in the State Department who are infected with the pro-Anglican virus and who are horrified at the thought of America's not helping England in a war. A neutrality act with presidential discretion as a part of it would be an excellent device for getting us into trouble.

The unwillingness of the State Department, despite all that devotion to peace with which it is charged by the War and Navy Departments, to make neutrality effective is to be seen in the list of articles held to be munitions that it prepared for the President. The argument is made that in modern warfare everything is a war munition; that to embargo munitions is to embargo all trade. This is not so. There are half a dozen essential elements of munition manufacture such as nickel, steel, chromium, manganese, cotton, perhaps some chemicals, which ought to be added to the list through supplementary legislation if necessary. The inclusion of these items would at least make the embargo effective. Whether or not this country wants to end all trade with warring nations is another matter. The President and his Department of State have complied with the law by making up the very narrowest list of embargoed articles that was possible.

Has the I.C.C. come to its senses? And the R.F.C. with it? Let us hope so. At least the refusal to pour any further government money into the bankrupt New Haven road is a hopeful sign. The I.C.C. declined to authorize a loan by the R.F.C. to the New Haven to pay taxes due to communities through which the road runs. The road already owes over $7,000,000 to the R.F.C. It asked for $7,000,000 more. The I.C.C. balked. Now reorganization begins. Watch the lawyers. JOHN T. FLYNN.

On the Labor Front

First Fruits of the Wagner-Connery Act—
The A.P. vs. the Newspaper Guild—
Red Scare in Atlantic City

A FORTNIGHT ago I observed in these pages that the National Labor Relations Board had been in a state bordering on suspended animation ever since the passage of the Wagner-Connery act last July; up to two weeks ago no complaint had been filed by the board against any employer. It is encouraging to report that this situation has changed. Several employers are now charged with unfair labor practices. The most important case—the one that is likely to be carried to the Supreme Court to test the validity of the Wagner measure—is that against the Pennsylvania Greyhound Lines, Inc. According to the complaint brought by the National Labor Relations Board, the Greyhound Lines discharged five employees for joining a union—the Amalgamated Association of Street Electric Railway and Motor Coach Employees of America. The company is also charged with intimidating other employees, keeping union meetings under surveillance and unlawfully contributing financial support to a company union. To expedite matters, the entire national board went to Pittsburgh last week to hear the case.

In this first test case, the labor board has chosen a company that is actually engaged in interstate commerce, but this does not mean that it will not attempt a broad interpretation in subsequent cases. On the contrary, Chairman J. Warren Madden is of the opinion that unfair labor practices in factories not only come within the scope of the Wagner law but also within the regulatory power of Congress. Speaking at the Atlantic City convention of the American Federation of Labor, he said:

> If the Congress may protect the flow of a regular interstate stream of live stock through stock yards, through packing plant to consumer in another state, by regulating the management of the stock yards, why may it not protect the interstate stream of raw materials, through factory to consumer in another state, by preventing unfair labor practices in the factory which threaten to interrupt that flow?

This sounds pretty sensible. It will be interesting to see what the Supreme Court does with it.

Another labor case that may soon reach national prominence is that of Morris Watson, who was recently discharged by the Associated Press under circumstances that strongly suggest discrimination by the A.P. against the American Newspaper Guild. Mr. Watson had been on the Associated Press staff for seven years and his work had been highly praised by the management. However, when he became active in the Guild—he is now national vice-president for Wire Services—the praise ceased, his right to sign his articles was virtually withdrawn, and he was demoted to less important, uncongenial work. Two weeks ago, after the A.P. had ordered its staff in New York, then enjoying a five-day week, back on a six-day week, the members of the A.P. unit of the Newspaper Guild requested the national Guild to bargain for them with the A.P. management. The Guild, accordingly, sent a letter asking for a

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

meeting to discuss collective bargaining—and shortly after this letter was received by the A.P. management Mr. Watson was discharged. The A.P. unit of the Guild has since voted unanimously that Mr. Watson was of "superior competence and integrity" and that his dismissal was for Guild activity. Meanwhile, the Associated Press has informed the American Newspaper Guild that it does not believe collective bargaining can serve any good purpose and might, instead, "disrupt the morale" of the staff. Of course, the A.P. would probably not insist that its attitude toward the organization of its own employees has anything to do with its unbiased reporting of labor news generally.

There were some of us at the A.F. of L. convention in Atlantic City who did not realize the extraordinary hazards we were running until some time later, when solicitous friends began asking us about the "Communist invasion" of the convention hall. There was, of course, no such invasion, but on Monday morning, October 14, the U.P. sent out the following story, and it was featured in many papers:

> Reports that Communists would stage a hostile demonstration in an attempt to break up the convention of the American Federation of Labor in the Hotel Chelsea here today led union officials and police to take extraordinary precautions to prevent disturbances.
>
> All but one of the doors of the auditorium were locked and only delegates with credentials were admitted. An emergency squad and detectives were held in readiness to intervene in case of trouble.

When the Publishers' Press-Radio Bureau got hold of this they dressed it up for the morning radio audience as follows:

> The American Federation of Labor swings into the second week of its convention at Atlantic City looking like an armed camp. As the delegates filed to their seats they were scrutinized by scowling guards, and doors and windows were heavily guarded by armed watchers.

All I can say about these reports is that those at the convention were wholly unaware of the amazing precautions taken to protect them. No policemen were stationed around the convention at any time during its entire two weeks, unless they (together with the "armed" guards) were hiding under the divans of the Chelsea lobby. The doors to the convention hall were wide open at all times, and anyone was free to enter and leave as he chose. No questions were asked and no credentials were necessary. The delegates, of course, did register for each day's session—for attendance records. The U. P. report is accurate, however, in saying that the convention was held at the Hotel Chelsea.

WILLIAM P. MANGOLD.

CORRESPONDENCE

Mr. Feinstein in Rebuttal

SIR: Commissioner Hodson, in reply to my article "Spying on the Jobless" [The New Republic, October 30], says that he never *saw* the Red list uncovered by the T.E.R.A. report. That may be true. There is no evidence that he *saw* the list. But my quotation from the report shows that he knew the list was in the adjoining office of his deputy, Stanley Howe, now secretary to Mayor LaGuardia.

Commissioner Hodson says the list was compiled without his approval, and that he does not approve discriminatory layoffs for organized activities. He admits he knew of the existence of the Red list in August, and he admits he knew why it was drawn up. Why didn't he stop its use? My quotation from the report of the mayor's committee in the following March shows that persons known to be active organizers were still being spied upon by the authorities. Commissioner Hodson does not deny this.

Commissioner Hodson says "a perfectly just and rational system of discharge" is impossible. No one denies that. But my quotations from the T.E.R.A. report show that the police and special investigators for the relief authorities deliberately went out to get something on active organizers and to find some excuse to discharge them.

The Commissioner says he never saw the suppressed report until he read extracts from it in the newspapers on October 16. He seems to have gone through it carefully since. He quotes two hitherto unpublished paragraphs showing that relief authorities did not try to *bar* radicals from relief and did not drop relief workers *merely* because of radical opinions. I made neither charge. The whole point of the T.E.R.A. report, as of my article on it, was that persons already on relief were spied upon and discharged whenever they became active in organizing the unemployed. Radicals who did not make the mistake of trying to get better conditions were unmolested. The relief policy was shown to be anti-organization and anti-labor, not anti-radical.

Commissioner Hodson terms me unfair for criticizing the mayor on relief. It is true that the Board of Estimate and the T.E.R.A. board jockey the relief budget between them, each trying to get the other to put up more than its share. But what has been the attitude of the mayor as head of the Board of Estimate?

The mayor packed his Committee on Relief with outstanding conservatives, but they—much to his surprise—turned in a report supporting the charges of the liberals and the radicals. They found city allowances 40 percent below the minimums set by private charities. The mayor has consistently ignored the report of his own committee, and he has yet to stage a fight in the Board of Estimate for decent relief.

Mayor LaGuardia's record in Congress shows that he is no sensitive plant. He *can* fight, when he wants to.

New York City. ISIDOR FEINSTEIN.

The Workers Speak

SIR: As a former executive secretary of the Associated Office and Professional Emergency Employees now merged into the City Projects Council, may I make some comments on Commissioner Hodson's answer to Mr. Isidor Feinstein's article, "Spying on the Jobless" and your editorial, "Terrorism for the Unemployed"?

Commissioner Hodson attempts to shift the real issue by pointing out that members of the A.O.P.E.E. were not refused work relief. We made no vigorous attempt to get individuals on work relief, being an organization of Works Division employees. But, Mr. Commissioner, what of the cases of Curry, Rosse, Wuntch, Crowe and others in which you refused open hearings to dismissed members of our organization?

No relief worker was dismissed for subscribing to Socialist, Communist or extremist doctrines, the Commissioner quotes the investigator. Certainly not! The Commissioner knew that we and the Civil Liberties Union would not let him get away with that. But how about those discriminatorily dismissed for "defiant attitude" and "insubordination" (with the time, place and circumstances not certified)?

The New Republic editorial lays the blame on social workers for bad labor relations. You have forgotten the second-line brain-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

trusters, the various Ph.D.'s. Your proposed solution is totally inadequate. We are not desirous of any Aristotelian catharsis no matter how distinguished the panel of citizens may be. We want results on specific cases and issues. We demand a voice in determining the labor policy of the W.P.A. on the basis of our program; specifically at this moment the establishment of a grievance board on which our representation would equal that of the administration.

Mr. Feinstein is correct in his analysis of what General Johnson's order to submit the names of individuals whom we represent means. We have no intention of obeying the rule. He might have added that the new administrator, despite protestations of liberalism, is, so far, no better than those who have preceded him. We are not accustomed to the method of advance that characterized the Sabine men, one step forward and two steps back. Commissioner Hodson and General Johnson now know it. The new administrator will learn it.

OSCAR R. FUSS, Executive Secretary,
New York City. City Projects Council.

[Mr. Fuss entirely misunderstood our editorial suggestion, one we have made on several previous occasions in The New Republic. Our proposal was of course that any committee that might be set up to hear grievances would also see to it that these grievances were remedied.—THE EDITORS.]

Mixing Art and Politics on the Air

SIR: On Sunday evening, October 6, I was casually listening to a musical program of excellent quality coming over a neighbor's radio. Came the intermission, and someone "of the Ford Motor Company" was introduced—the usual advertising blah-blah, thought I, and turned off my attention.

But this fellow was different. He didn't talk about Tin Lizzie's heirs—he talked about sports, and what a grand lot of he-men we have taking part in them, the rigorous training they go through, etc., etc. And he went on to show how we demanded fight, and competition, and individuality in our players. And thus in life, says he, Americans demand fight and competition and individuality in business. We can learn many lessons from our sports, especially those government officials who are "inoculated with foreign notions." "Why," says he, "if they ran baseball as they have tried to run business, there wouldn't be any baseball left." The quotations are accurate, and the rest indicates roughly the general line of thought, and anyone can see where it is leading.

I protest, most vehemently, that the intrusion of political propaganda into the midst of a concert program not only violates our esthetic sensibilities but the proprieties of advertising sponsorship as well. It is bad enough that we must listen to a lot of advertising hot air, but if the large corporations sponsoring radio hours are going to spill in a lot of capitalistic and fascistic propaganda, then it is high time for a protest on the part of radio owners.

If we want to listen to politics, we have an ample supply of political broadcasts from which to choose, but to butt in on a concert program to foist controversial politics on the listener whether he will or no is highly impertinent and distinctly out of order.

New York City. DANIEL HIESTER KRUPP.

The Revolt in Asturias

SIR: In the article, "The Revolt in Asturias," by Maria Teresa León, appearing in the September 25 issue of The New Republic, there are some statements that are misleading, for they give the impression that all the rebels were miners, that all the miners were Socialists and that "the little anarchist group of Gijón" is the only anarchist movement there is in Asturias.

As a matter of historical record let it be stated that although the majority of the rebel miners are Socialists, there are many who are Communists or Anarchists, and that in other cities and towns where there are no miners, the workers, Communists, Socialists and Anarchists alike, fought with the same determination as the miners.

Although the Socialists are numerically stronger than the Anarchists or Communists, they are far from constituting the whole or most of the radical movement. As matter of fact, there are sections where the Socialist influence is negligible. Such is the case in Gijón (the principal port in Asturias) and La Felguera, where the Anarchists have held sway for a third of a century, the same being true, in a lesser degree, of practically the whole coast.

From Miss De León's article one gathers that the revolution was planned and carried out solely by the Socialists, which is not correct. The Asturias revolution was the work of a united front of Socialists, Communists and Anarchists who, under a formal pact of their respective organizations, had been preparing the ground and arming themselves for nearly a year.

Chicago, Ill. MAXIMILIAN OLAY.

From The New Republic Mail Bag

DAVID MILLS of Brooklyn, New York, disagrees with the estimate of left-wing strength in the Socialist Party contained in Ludwig Lore's recent article on the Socialist Labor International [The New Republic, October 2]. Mr. Mills thinks Mr. Lore indulged in some wishful thinking and cites evidences of strength in the old-line Socialists, and defections from the party where and when the militant elements gained control. . . . Mary R. Beard believes that a World Center for Women's Archives should be created to correlate and preserve the records of women's achievements the world over. She is heading a committee of distinguished women who are working to make this project an actuality. She cites the growth of Fascist theories about the inferiority of women as showing the need for feminists to form a permanent world center. . . . James Rorty, editor of Consumers' Defender, the magazine published by Coöperative Distributors, Inc., calls upon New York consumers of drugs and cosmetics who are interested in correcting the frauds and abuses so prevalent in these trades to communicate with the Consumers' Action Committee, 30 Irving Place, New York City. The committee plans to make a strong presentation in favor of the proposed amendments to New York's sanitary code when public hearings are held beginning December 2. . . . Among the persons expressing approval of the article, "Back to Panhandling," by J. O. Reade in The New Republic for October 9 is Miss Bertha McCall, general director of the National Association for Travelers' Aid and Transient Service. Miss McCall says that transient unemployed deserve sympathetic consideration of their difficulties and believes that it would be shameful for the federal government to abandon completely all transient relief. . . . A correspondent in Queensland, Australia, who asks that his name be withheld, applauds America's desire to remain neutral in any forthcoming world conflict but cites one instance in which he thinks American participation would be justified. He conjures up the old Yellow Peril bogey that Japan has designs on Australia and with the seizure of that continent and its natural resources could become so powerful as to menace the entire white race. . . . Gloria E. Wilson, secretary of the class in economics at George Williams College, Chicago, sends us copies of questionnaires that the class has dispatched to Consumers' Research, Inc., and to the Consumers' Research strikers. Some of the questions are very searching and if candid replies are forthcoming the class hopes to formulate a basis on which the strike might be settled. . . . Charles West, president of the Rogers Park Civic League in Chicago, says he is a loyal Republican of the progressive wing and protests vehemently against the efforts to foist Hoover upon the party as its candidate in 1936. Mr. West dumps Herbert Hoover, Colonel Knox and Hamilton Fish into one general bouillabaisse, whiffs the brew and says he will have none of it. . . . Peter Guldbrandsen tells of the formation of the League Against Yellow Journalism with headquarters at 966 Hillsdale Avenue, Berkeley, California. The League is actively opposing the policies of William Randolph Hearst and is distributing stamps bearing the slogan "I Don't Read Hearst" at the cost price of five cents per sheet of fifty stamps. . . . Gertrude Folks Zimand, associate general secretary of the National Child Labor Committee, quotes a resolution presented at the recent American Federation of Labor Convention by Robert Watt, secretary of the Massachusetts Federation. The Watt resolution calls upon the Catholic Church in America to take a stand that child labor is "a matter of economic and social legislation on which Catholic priests, laymen and legislators may speak and vote according to their individual judgment as citizens of the United States."

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Poetic Chances

I HAD intended from the start to see Mr. Maxwell Anderson's "Winterset" again; and a second visit, as was always manifest, merely enlarges the first impression. The purpose of a work of art is to arouse our response to its content; the ideal means employed will be that which will bring forth the fullest of responses. In the case of "Winterset" the means is, of course, a poetic medium of expression. But there is also a list of characters unusually clear and firm in their outline, and raised far beyond the limits of our familiar stage. These varieties of character are further intensified, each in itself, so that they strike one against another at a high level, or on an intense plane. All these people are seen in a tremendous—and genuinely created—perspective: the judge haunted by a sentence he passed, the son of the victim haunted by his father's innocence, and divers others driven forward by forces within the years. This uncommonly strong element of perspective in the play relates it further, in some elusive sense, to the poetic medium. The alternating resistance and advance of metrical form appears doubly right in the conveyance of this check and impulse, memory and passion, fateful past and power of life, that the characters' lives proceed upon.

Discussion of the use of poetry in drama will always be likely to end in confusion. To some persons the mere term implies the great and deep, to others the soft and pretty. To some—this notion is more nearly ineradicable—great intellectual conceptions appear in prose; we go to poetry for a beautiful and moving expression of concepts already known to us. This is but partially true. The successful poetic expression of a concept is likely to be the first complete expression of it, since in such a case the concept in full is expressed in terms of the complete human being and the human being in terms of the concept. One of the great descriptions of poetry is Dante's saying that poetry is the loving use of wisdom. In praising the poetic style we must not say that our present American drama may be too austere or stark. The proper word is barren (or arid, or merely journalistic).

It gets nowhere to say, as Mr. Richard Watts, Jr. did in The Herald Tribune of a fortnight back, that "the state of dramatic poetry being what it is, the playwright who relies on the quality of his conception rather than on the turn of his phrases is most likely to qualify as a master of a great lyric mood." Conception is inseparable from expression. The playwright who relies on the turn of a phrase, except in so far as that phrase is organic and necessary to the conception, writes not only bad drama, he writes bad poetry. The defects in "Winterset," in the last act especially, are not due to the fact that the poetic form is being employed, but rather to the fact that the poetry is bad, bad either *per se* or bad in relation to the scene—it comes to the same thing.

Mr. Watts says also that "recognized lyric forms are clearly no more adapted to the use of drama these days than they are to other types of current narrative and, since they were originally devised for other days, it is not easy to employ their archaic mannerisms in the service of authentic and convincing dramatic speech." You may almost as well say recognized human forms are with difficulty suited to acting. A poet-playwright will, naturally, in so far as he is successful, use only such poetic forms as express his content. But much of any content belongs to centuries, not decades. And recognized lyric forms do not necessarily imply archaic mannerisms.

"The last fifteen minutes of the play strike me as dull and unfortunate, chiefly because Mr. Anderson appears to be presenting a defeatist argument on behalf of the beauties of compromise in modern life, and although that message of his may have its practical virtues it does not exactly express a poetic subject." For my part, I thought merely that Mr. Anderson got himself rather far afield with some handsome semi-Irish-poetical, often extraneous and willful, lines and cadences, and thus crippled the effect. At any rate, it is true that there is no such thing as a non-poetic subject. The possibilities, near and far, of any subject will depend on the artist undertaking it. "I fear," says Mr. Watts, of the last quarter-hour, "that the slightly muddy confusion of the play's ideas may hurt the poetic drama in so far as it suggests that lyricism and hard-headed contemplation have difficulty in getting along together in the theatre." Suggesting difficulty in art hurts nothing; it intimidates fools; it raises the level of the enterprise.

Whatever confusion there may be does not arise from lyricism and contemplation's finding it hard to get along together in the theatre; the confusion arises from the writing's not having absorbed and expressed the thought with completeness sufficient to include the writer's full self, brain, emotions and so on. As a matter of fact, all theatrical expression of thought includes immediately a certain lyricism. Contemplation in itself—if there be such a thing—will not project itself into the audience. Nor will the audience contemplate what it can acquire no feeling for.

Speaking practically, on our American theatre's behalf, the greatest compliment we could pay a poetic play is to say it does no harm to poetic drama's chances. In spite of its defects, and in spite of the threats in the last act to do so, "Winterset" does not harm the cause of poetic drama. In its best moments we are aware of the poetic medium only as a matter of heightened respiration on our part. The lines hint of intensified feeling and thought, and of words with all the emphasis of passionate life repeated. At its worst we have only verses that are sucking a sugar-teat in the Muses' nursery. In such of Mr. Anderson's verse the images appear to be a hangover of the period when Stephen Phillips' cadences were petals of blown roses on the grass. In such cases Mr. Anderson, both as poet and playwright, needs to get away, not so much from traditional forms in poetry as from a merely traditional use of them regardless of their content.

It is true, of course, that on Broadway one must be completely successful, tossing off with facility what the greatest artists might retreat from in despair. "Winterset" is fair enough melodrama at bottom, which is saying a good deal. Why should we expect, also, that a playwright should, almost single-handed, produce a completely successful poetic drama? I should rather say that "Winterset" is not only and easily the most important play of this season, but also the most notable effort in the poetic dramatic medium that up to now we have had in the American theatre.

STARK YOUNG.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

BOOKS IN REVIEW

Mr. Lewis Says It Can

MR. SINCLAIR LEWIS has a flair for the provocative. "Main Street," "Babbitt," "Arrowsmith" and "Elmer Gantry" set going currents of discussion in regard to various aspects of American life and standards of American culture. It is natural that, after dealing with family, business, science and religion he should turn in this latest novel[1] to politics, the most immediately exciting contemporary theme.

His scene is not laid in the present, however, but in the future, a year or two hence when the election of 1936 has made Berzelius Windrip President and given him the opportunity to usurp dictatorial powers. What follows is a translation of the German Nazi revolution into American terms. The Storm Troops become Minute Men; Göring, Goebbels, Müller, von Blomberg, become Sarason, Windrip's aid and mentor, Macgoblin, Bishop Prang, Dewey Haik. For half the book Mr. Lewis heads his chapters with quotations from Windrip's "Zero Hour," which is an American version of "Mein Kampf." It is too bad that the author grew tired of this amusing parody. The accounts of torture inflicted on the critics of the regime in prisons and concentration camps are excerpts from "The Brown Book of the Hitler Terror"; the espionage, and the underground tactics of the opponents, are drawn from present-day activities in Germany. The addiction to homosexuality on the part of the Minute Men is peculiar in its political importance to the German revolution. The apology for the whole outrageous assault on human decency, put in the mouth of a young conformist, is the German plea in American language:

> They've revitalized the whole country. Formerly we had gotten pretty sordid, just thinking about material possessions and comforts—about electric refrigeration and television and air-conditioning. Kind of lost the sturdiness that characterized our pioneer ancestors. Why, ever so many young men were refusing to take military drill, and the discipline and will power and good fellowship that you only get from military training.

It is unnecessary to discuss Mr. Lewis' right to make a novel based upon social sanctions. The novel has always lent itself readily to propaganda. It may be noticed that such *tendenz* fiction has accompanied epochs of social change and preceded social upheavals, as in the case of the French Revolution, the revolutions of 1848 and those of 1919. "It Can't Happen Here" may thus have the significance of a social portent. It is, however, obligatory to discuss Mr. Lewis' book in relation to its genre. The usual device of the propagandist in fiction is to select a character as a vehicle whose experience and comment reflect the author's attitude. Mr. Lewis has chosen for this role Doremus Jessup, editor of a local newspaper at Fort Beulah, Vermont. The danger in this proceeding is that the character will lose his own individuality in going about his author's business—as in Romain Rolland's revolutionary novel "Clerambault" or Zola's "Fécondité," where the hero is so busy rushing about to see how his friends misbehave as to leave him, it would seem, no time to exercise those admirable procreative functions with which the author has endowed him for the repeopling of France.

Mr. Lewis has avoided this common error. We believe in Doremus. He is made real to us by pleasant little touches, such as always carrying on a journey the first volume of Spengler's "Decline of the West." We infer that it is part of the author's kindness to spare him the second volume. Indeed, Mr. Lewis has dropped the detachment that was a feature in his earlier characterizations, and is clearly attached to Doremus. We may set it down to pure good nature that he allows that hero a little illicit sexual intercourse as compensation for his tortures. We do not believe in Doremus as a lover, however, but we do believe in him when, with the author's sanction, he says: "I am convinced that everything that is worth while in the world has been accomplished by the free inquiring critical spirit, and that the preservation of this spirit is more important than any social system whatever."

Like other novelists of purpose Mr. Lewis tends to make his minor characters types to represent various social attitudes. We can hardly disbelieve in them, however, in view of the presence in our midst of Mr. William Randolph Hearst, Mr. Hanford MacNider, General Hugh S. Johnson, General Charles E. Dawes and Mrs. Dilling. In the case of the preposterous Mrs. Adelaide Tarr Gimmitch criticism folds up, and we cry for more. The characters of the inner group surrounding Doremus are unreal because Mr. Lewis has not taken much trouble with them. One regrets Lorinda Pike, who is introduced to give Doremus a little joy in life, and the egregious Sissy, from the hand that drew Leora in "Arrowsmith."

The final questions that must be asked of propaganda fiction are: is it important, and is it true? As to the first, the answer in respect to Mr. Lewis' novel is Yes. Fascism constitutes a definite and present danger, and resistance to it is among the attitudes that ought to be propagated. As to the second, one has reservations. Mr. Lewis has laid his scene in the future and cannot be held to such strict accountability as if he had written a historical novel; but it is not so far in the future as to escape the test of the present. No one who has seen and heard a convention of the American Legion (or even of the N.E.A. or the A.F. of L. or the D.A.R.) can deny the frightful plausibility of such an assertion of the herd instinct, but to gain control it would require a longer time than Mr. Lewis allows. The opening scene of the Ladies' Night Dinner of the Fort Beulah Rotary Club, done in Mr. Lewis' best satiric manner, is hardly strong enough to propel us across the chasm into a fascist regime. There are more sinister elements in our immediate situation than Rotary, particularly the complacence of constituted authorities in the face of fascist threats. In Germany the republican government, while punishing Communists severely, showed extreme toleration to fascists practising violence, exactly as our government does today. President Roosevelt had no rebuke for the murderous Vigilantes at San Francisco, even though his agent had egged them on. ("Hunt them down like rats!" "General Johnson speaks for me.") The breakdown of legitimate government is the most important prelude to revolution, and of this Mr. Lewis gives no hint.

Again, a lack of perspective becomes evident in the Res-

[1] It Can't Happen Here, by Sinclair Lewis. New York: Doubleday, Doran and Company. $2.50.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

toration, in which Walt Trowbridge describes government as "a universal partnership in which the state must own all resources so large that they affect all members of the state, and in which the one worst crime won't be murder or kidnaping but taking advantage of the state." It must be admitted that Mr. Lewis' book lacks terminal facilities, at both ends, but within its limits it carries freight in abundance, of large importance, under high steam power of righteous indignation and generous good will.

ROBERT MORSS LOVETT.

The Correspondence of Titans

The Correspondence of Karl Marx and Friedrich Engels. New York: International Publishers. 568 pages. $3.75.

THIS BOOK contains but a small portion of the rich Marx-Engels correspondence published in four large volumes in German, as well as some letters to third persons. It conveys to the reader, as no other Marxian documents can, that the two Titans were at once profound economic and political thinkers, foremost tacticians and organizers of labor, masters of polemic and journalists with tart and trenchant pens.

And what a rich scene is passed in review: the expansion of modern industry, the emergence of the proletariat as a revolutionary class, the national struggles beclouding the proletarian movement, the national and international organization of labor. A host of crucial personalities march before us, labeled with sharp and stinging epithets. Liebknecht is a "cow"; Bernstein is a "philistine"; Kautsky is a "mediocrity with a small-minded outlook"; Lassalle is always "Baron Itzig." Proudhon's theoretical learning is "schoolboyish," while Bakunin's program is an "infant's spelling book." Kossuth is "false" and "cowardly," Mazzini is ignorant of the material needs of Italy's agricultural population and Thiers is "that mischievous abortion."

The nationality question is discussed again and again. Marx and Engels greeted the unification of Germany as proletarians and internationalists and not as patriots. Unification would effect the centralization of the German working class, transfer the center of gravity of the workers' movement from France to Germany, establish the predominance of revolutionary Marxism over petty-bourgeois Proudhonism. Marx and Engels bitterly opposed the annexation of Alsace-Lorraine as the greatest misfortune that could befall Europe. They worked for the dissolution of the union between England and Ireland, because the overthrow of the English aristocracy in Ireland was the first condition for the emancipation of the English working class. They strove to achieve Poland's freedom from Russia in order to undermine Russia's counter-revolutionary influence in Europe.

The "Selected Correspondence" is full of letters that should prove indispensable to our modern labor leaders and theorists. Engels' reflections on the American labor movement, urging socialists to work within the existing labor organizations and not to split them, and to form a distinct working-class party, should be studied by Socialists and Communists alike. His letters of September 21 and October 27, 1890, which contain the clearest expositions of the materialist conception of history in existence, might be digested with profit by the high priests who repeat Marx by rote. "We make our own history," wrote Engels to Bloch, "but in the first place under very definite presuppositions and conditions. Among these the economic ones are finally decisive. But the political, etc., ones, and indeed even the traditions which haunt the human mind, also play a part, although not the decisive one."

Significant in the collection is Engels' letter to Bebel, criticizing the revisionism of the Gotha draft program of the German party. This document, together with Marx's critique of the same program, was one of Lenin's chief sources in his "State and Revolution." Engels speaks of the proletarian state as a transitional institution used by the proletariat not "in the interests of freedom, but to hold down its adversaries." When the state has lost its reason for existence, said Engels, it will "wither away," a phrase nowhere used by Marx, but employed by Lenin with telling effect.

One must think of Marx and Engels as revolutionists first and foremost. In their writings they discussed not so much the method of making a revolution—that was Lenin's problem—but the conditions that caused it. Prophetically enough, they believed that the inevitable social revolution would probably spring from a world war in which the defeat of Russia, the bulwark of reaction, would hasten the revolution in Russia and carry down with it the Hohenzollern dynasty. A revolution leading to socialism was not impossible in Russia, despite its retarded economy, for there is no general plan of economic development. Stages can be skipped. Analagous events taking place in different historic surroundings can lead to totally different results. The revolution in Russia may become the signal for a revolution in the West, the one supplementing the other.

The colorful expressions and spontaneity of the letters of Marx and Engels have seldom been surpassed. The breadth of their views, the ruthlessness with which they are stated, the realistic language in which they are couched, and the frequent and ingenious prophecies have an overpowering effect on the reader. But the edition leaves something to be desired. The notes, though generally good and copious, suffer from an open prejudice against all unofficial heterodoxies. The long note on Kautsky is hostile from beginning to end. The editor might have read Lenin, who, though he branded Kautsky a renegade, was ready to recognize his services to Socialist theory. Moreover, the number of aspersive letters with reference to Lassalle is out of all proportion to the volume. True, Lassalle advocated the founding of workers' factories *à la* Louis Blanc; he attempted to tie up with the Schulze-Delitzsch organizations; he flirted with Bismarck. But he founded the first important political organization of the working class. With this colossal service, for which he will always be remembered in the history of the labor movement, Lassalle isn't even credited outright by the editor of the "Selected Correspondence." The long note on Lassalle has not even a suggestion of Marx's and Engels' high opinion of his services after the dissolution of the Communist League.

But the most serious fault is the omission of the whole period before 1846, the years during which Marx and Engels were moving from idealism to materialism. These years are rich in correspondence. A selection from it, carefully annotated and replacing comparatively unimportant letters, would have thrown light on the forging of the historical-materialistic doctrine, the very kernel of Marxian thought. Instead, the "Selected Correspondence" leaves the impression that Marx and Engels were born Communists; that their intellectual lives were static and not changing; that their mature ideas crystallized at one stroke. In this respect, the edition under review loses some of its Marxian flavor. And yet it remains by all odds the most important item of Marxian literature to appear in this country since the translations of "The Communist Manifesto" and "Capital."

SAMUEL BERNSTEIN.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

In Simple Language

Genetics, by H. S. Jennings. New York: W. W. Norton and Company. 384 pages. $4.

IN HUXLEY'S generation society was actively absorbing the produce of the laboratory. Naturally enough, a widespread confidence in education prevailed. Men of science felt that society needed their best efforts, and believed that they could count on intelligent sympathy. Lectures such as those which Huxley, Ball and Tyndall delivered ostensibly to audiences of working men were the expression of such confidence, and they still remain models of exposition with which few contemporary exercises in scientific popularization will bear favorable comparison. The great Victorians were content to engage the understanding of the average man in well established scientific truths and the application of these truths as "useful" knowledge.

The current fashion is to retail the latest and most controversial hypotheses and extrapolations, especially those which bear no promise of any immediate social application and rely exclusively on symbolism beyond the range of any but a few specialists. No doubt the result is often flattering to the scientist, who reverts to his former role in the calendar priesthoods of antiquity, when astronomer was also priest. Scientific workers who take a long view of the situation may hesitate to welcome the apotheosis of Einstein and Heisenberg as a sign of general well being.

Among the few contemporary writers who have the acumen and modesty to say in simple language the simple things that complicated people so often overlook, Professor Jennings can rightly claim to have established himself in his previous book as a writer and expositor in the Huxleyan tradition. The remarkable sales of "The Biological Basis of Human Nature" have shown that when an intelligent publisher dares to provide the reading public with genuine instruction people will pay for it as eagerly as they will purchase the pleasure of being mystified by J. W. N. Sullivan, Gerald Heard or the Gollancz Outline for children and parents.

Those who buy Professor Jennings' new book because they live in circles where conversation is confined to discoveries that have not been disproved during the current fortnight, will be sorely disappointed. Its chief merit is that it attempts to give a clearly reasoned and illustrated account of firmly grounded truths, and covers little ground that has not been traversed in Morgan's "Theory of the Gene" or Haldane's "Causes of Evolution"—except in so far as it contains an up-to-date summary of the pivotal inquiries that America's brilliant geneticist, H. J. Muller, is now prosecuting at the Moscow Academy of Sciences. Consequently the reader may rest assured that the conclusions stated are generally accepted by all the leading workers on problems of heredity, and the facts themselves have now been confirmed by abundance of independent testimony.

Naturally one does not always see eye to eye with Professor Jennings in his more general philosophical reflections, which in this book, as in his last, are confined to the last few pages. For instance, he is more pessimistic than most experimental geneticists when he expresses strong disinclination to believe that gene mutations are the raw materials of "progressive evolution." The reasons he gives for his doubts do not carry weight with the present writer, and in any case the position he takes does not seem to be quite consistent. Of evolution in the genetic sense we can have no knowledge beyond what genetic experiment provides. Darwin's theory is built on two main foundation stones. First is the fact that organisms have come to differ historically by a gradual process. Second is the fact that man has used the processes of heredity and variation to produce new varieties of organisms for domestic use. That the gene theory gives a satisfactory account of the outstanding phenomena of domestic varieties is now beyond dispute, and Professor Jennings would hardly question it. It is precisely these phenomena which justify our belief that geological succession represents an evolution in the biological sense of the term.

American readers will not need to be reminded that the practical achievements of the new knowledge have brought us a long way towards the possibility of plenty for all. In England, where agricultural practice has changed very little since the Hanoverian dynasty was founded and where practical genetics is usually confused with surgical assaults upon the less dangerous kinds of stupidity, the usefulness of Professor Jennings' book would be greatly increased if in some future edition it were to include a survey of the way in which genetic science is shaping the future of food production.

LANCELOT HOGBEN.

Harmless Hugh

The Inquisitor, by Hugh Walpole. New York: Doubleday, Doran and Company. $3.

IN SPITE of what the poet Yeats says, men do not always improve with the years. But for some of those who don't, life appears to compensate; it improves itself by getting simpler. As these lucky fellows grow older they have less time to make up their minds, and less mind to make up.

All this reminds me that Mr. Hugh Walpole has written another book. This time he's gone back to Polchester, his cathedral town. Perhaps it's supposed to remind you of "Edwin Drood"—it's certainly supposed to remind you of Dickens. I won't tell you the story: it's just Life, in Mr. Walpole's simplified and improved version. Here are a few improvements that struck my eye. (1) "All lonely women are beautiful when their terror of loneliness is removed from them." (2) "On many a later occasion Klitch was to recall every detail of that afternoon." (3) "Women, in shrill voices, cried 'Bravo! Bravo!'" (at a Communist workers' meeting). (4) "But the principal reason why men are more important than women in England is that men can in that country do without women in every element of life except the least important, the physical. Of no other country in the world can this be said. Friendship among men in England is never expressed, but once the pact is made it can withstand every attempt to break it—geography, history, sex, finance, erudition, even sport—none of these can affect it."

Well, what's wrong with Mr. Walpole? Lots of people read him with pleasure, with (some of them even think) profit. He's practically the Proctor of Letters in upper-middle-class England, where they're all so well educated and speak with such cultivated voices. And even Hollywood respects him. Dear reader, if you can't see what's wrong with him, let's not pry into the matter. Let's just borrow Mr. Walpole's habit of improving the truth by simplifying it, and say he's harmless.

T. S. MATTHEWS.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Armchair Reading

Youth Uncharted, by Stephen Lawford. New York: The Macmillan Company. 332 pages. $2.50.

THOUGH the title of this book might lead one to expect a novel of pubescence afire, it is in reality the personal record of a young Englishman's adventures, near adventures and non-adventures during the World War and after. Steamed up with patriotism in 1914, Stephen Lawford (then under age) wangled his way into the British army, served two years in India, was wounded near Aden during the Arabian campaign, and thereafter knocked about South Russia arranging for the transport of raw materials. He had the regular attitude of middle-class England to the Bolsheviks. He managed to get out from under when the Red army captured Novorossiisk and landed in Tiflis on a lugger with a cargo of the Tsar's brandy and a small passenger list of heterosexual dancers. For several years thereafter he was involved in the Balkan tangle, acting as British Refugee Commissioner for the hordes of White Russians Denikin left stranded in the Near East. The book, after describing some relatively mild adventures in South America, ends with its author washed up on the (at that time) tranquil shores of Geneva, anchored to one of the organizations of the International Civil Service.

One cannot say that the author's prose or his adventures reach breath-taking heights, but the book is written with verve and a large measure of animal spirits. The most entertaining part is that describing Lawford's post-war experiences in the Balkans, particularly the fantastic trip to Tiflis, on which events and characters achieve that cosmopolitan unreality one only finds in Paul Morand at his best. Add to the natural ingredients of the book several whiskey-and-sodas, a comfortable chair, and anyone not bored by a fluent stream of well told anecdotes will find a pleasant and not wholly unprofitable evening between its covers.

SLATER BROWN.

The Plantation System

America's Tragedy, by James Truslow Adams. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons. 421 pages. $3.

THIS BOOK, the author tells us in his preface, is a study of sectionalism. To me it seems to be merely another of the books on this subject being written with an eye to Southern sensibilities and general sales. Mr. Adams believes that the horrors of slavery have been greatly exaggerated, except of course those of the African slave trade, for which greedy and sanctimonious New Englanders were to blame. In defense of this thesis he descends to such impertinences as "Would a Du Bois prefer to be headman to an African chief instead of a Harvard graduate, scholar and writer? Would a Robeson prefer beating a tom-tom?" etc. Much of the book is on this level.

There is little evidence in these four hundred pages of research or original work of any kind. Mr. Adams for the most part contents himself with repeating the stencils of earlier Southern apologists about Southern culture, the Negro, slavery and the plantation system, though he does, here and there, introduce facts that invalidate his main assumptions. "The passionate nature and lax morals of the Negro," for instance, are "well known" when Mr. Adams wishes to show that forced sexual intercourse between white masters and slave women was very rare and was in any case

Diego Rivera

A Nazi Storm Trooper

has written a pamphlet on anti-Semitism in Germany. He exposes the forgeries in fascist race "statistics," the "Protocols of the Elders of Zion," and the charge of "ritual murder."

¶ THE INTERNATIONAL RELIEF ASSOCIATION will issue this pamphlet for distribution to Nazi Party members and sympathizers. If one Storm Trooper can so intelligently question false race theories, his reactions, widespread, will enlighten many others. We can publish and distribute this pamphlet throughout Germany if we can raise $5,000 at once.*

¶ Will you help undermine Hitler in his drive against Jews, Catholics and Protestants by contributing to make this pamphlet possible?

INTERNATIONAL RELIEF ASSOCIATION
FREDA KIRCHWEY, *Treasurer*

* All surplus above the actual cost of issue and distribution is added to the relief fund.

FREDA KIRCHWEY, *Treasurer,*
INTERNATIONAL RELIEF ASSOCIATION,
20 Vesey Street, New York City.

I will be glad to give $..... to help spread within Germany the pamphlet exposing the false race theories of the Nazis.

Name.....

Street.....

City.....

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

BORZOI BOOKS

By the Author of
AND QUIET FLOWS THE DON

Mikhail Sholokhov's
new novel of
the Don Cossacks

Seeds of Tomorrow

or Virgin Soil Upturned

No other book has revealed so richly and dramatically the struggle between the old and the new in Soviet Russia—a struggle which wrenched families and towns apart—as this magnificent novel of the Don Cossacks, hunters, horsemen, warriors, emerging from the primitive to the civilized. 404 *pages*, $2.50

ALFRED · A · KNOPF

THE INSTITUTE FOR SOCIAL EDUCATION
Los Angeles, California
Presents
BRUCE BLIVEN
lecturing on
THE PRESS:
Propaganda or Public Interest?
at the
Pacific Institute of Music and Fine Arts
3189 Wilshire Boulevard, corner Vermont
Los Angeles, Calif.
WED., NOV. 13th at 8 p.m.
*Admission: 50c, 75, $1; no tax**
Tickets available at
Modern Forum, 427 W. 5th St., Phone, MUtual 0048
* *Discounts to Modern Forum members*

The EPIC PLAN discussed in an exciting DEBATE
Upton SINCLAIR vs. Norman THOMAS
Roger Baldwin, *Chairman*
MECCA TEMPLE, Sunday, Nov. 17th, at 8 P.M.
Tickets: 55c, 83c, $1.10, $1.65. From: Socialist Call, Workers' Bookshop, Rand School, Columbia Univ. Bookstore and New York Forum.
Auspices: New York Forum, 39 East 10th Street, New York City
Subject: Production for Use—Can It Be Established under Capitalism?

no great hardship on the woman. Yet when he wishes to show that slavery was on the whole a paternalistic and beneficent institution, he discovers that "the fact that the white master could go into the army, leaving his lonely and often remote plantation, his wife and children . . . in the care of the slaves, speaks volumes for the qualities of the black race."

Finally, "the chief distinction of the Southern way of life was that it was primarily based on human rather than material values." But to say that a "way of life" that is based fundamentally on human slavery is based primarily on human values is simply to destroy the meaning of language. None of the dominant ways of life, Northern or Southern, was based on such values. But the Abolitionists had at least caught a glimpse of them, and this Thoreau expressed when he said: "If I devote myself to other pursuits and contemplations I must see at least that I do not pursue them sitting on another man's back. I must get off him first . . . that he may pursue his contemplation too."

MARTHA GRUENING.

Coaltown

Horse Shoe Bottoms, by Tom Tippett. New York: Harper and Brothers. $2.50.

THIS NOVEL gives a typical and good picture of mining life and the beginnings of unionism in the coal fields. Tippett does not exaggerate the dialects or bad grammar of the miners; he does not picture them as a race brutalized by their work or made uncouth by the drabness of their mining camps; he does not express surprise when a character appears who understands the economics of coal or the philosophy of the labor movement. He himself is the son and the grandson of miners, and he knows his people. He knows mining, too, from long years of underground work; and his description of a mine explosion and its aftermath is easily the best in American literature.

This book is realism, but it is not exaggerated realism. Its theme is simple—the arrival of English immigrants at a newly opened slope mine at Horse Shoe Bottoms, the change of ownership from the miner who developed the property to a city corporation, the worsening of conditions as a result of the drive for profits and the competitive situation in the industry. Strikes are lost and won, several of the main characters are blacklisted, and some of them have to lease a small wagon mine to provide themselves with work. There are secret meetings and divisions in the ranks of the workers themselves. And there are all the general details, in all their dullness and beauty, of a miner's life.

It is with the characters that the author has done his best work. Andy the mule driver, the agitator who is driven with his family from mine to mine, the original owner of the mine, who drinks himself to death after thirty-nine of his old friends have died in an explosion. And the women: Eliza and Ellen and Martha Haywood, who raises her children and backs up her husband to the finish. These people were in the coal fields of Illinois forty years ago, all English or of English descent; but during the ten years that I worked in the mines or organized for the miners' union, I have met and known the same characters in the coal fields of Pennsylvania and Colorado, even though they were Slavs, Italians, Irish—almost any nationality. The publishers do not exaggerate when they state that Tom Tippett has created the American counterpart of Emile Zola's "Germinal."

POWERS HAPGOOD.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Books in Brief

Mottke the Thief, by Sholem Asch. New York: G. P. Putnam's Sons. $2.50.

ALTHOUGH this novel is slight and unsatisfactory, it cannot be thought of as an anticlimax to Asch's "Three Cities," for it was written some years before that respectable work. Mottke begins as a boy in a Polish village and, after years of terrible mistreatment, wins a kind of respect for himself by becoming the Mowgli of the village dogs. He runs away, falls in with an itinerant tumbling troupe, wins the beautiful tightrope dancer, and murders his enemy to acquire a passport and a name. In Warsaw he sets up as a bully with the dancing-girl as his chief asset, and seems to be on the way to prosperity. But he is undone when he falls in love with respectability in the person of the innocent daughter of a brothel keeper. He sells his string of girls and sets up as a fish merchant. But when, tortured by being loved under the name of the man he had murdered, he confides his crime to his respectable fiancée, she respectably betrays him and he, refusing the loyalty of his cast-off dancer, allows himself to be taken. Isolated parts of the book have some interest of local color, as for example the life of the Polish village, child labor in the glass factories, the Warsaw prostitute trade and the export of girls to Buenos Aires. But the book as a whole is written in the naked, linear style of the picaresque novel with a sentimental irony superadded. L. T.

Autobiography of Earth, by John Hogdon Bradley. New York: Coward-McCann. 347 pages, illustrated. $3.

This is frankly a book on geology for those who know little more about the earth than what their eyes casually see or their feet carelessly walk on. The venerable science is dramatized, and the not-too-familiar scene becomes a battleground of terrific forces reaching from far below the bottom of the oceans to high above the peaks of the Himalayas. The descriptions of earth movements and the endless conflict between land and water are graphically done; while chapters on earthquakes, volcanoes, glaciers, ocean currents and the great mountain systems provide an exciting background for the origin of life and the rise of human cultures out of a muck of fossils, toward "the same inevitable end" of death and extinction. The book is somewhat overwritten, as though the author felt that his readers were more interested in marvels than in knowledge. There is, however, a reasonable infusion of the latter for those who do not mind an excess of rhetoric. H. W.

Chopin: His Life, by William Murdoch. New York: The Macmillan Company. 410 pages. $3.

This is an honest, complete and excellently written statement of what is known concerning the life and character of Chopin. The author is an English pianist who writes of his subject with special sympathy. A later volume will deal with Chopin as composer, pianist and teacher. B. H. H.

Rubber Truncheon, by Wolfgang Langhoff. New York: E. P. Dutton and Company. 278 pages. $2.50.

This document from the New Germany is no atrocity story but a statement of the facts. Langhoff, a non-political actor, was arrested without being told the charge, remained in jail without being arraigned before a judge, and was released without a word of explanation. He tells how it was in prison: insults, brutality, murder. But what principally distinguishes his book is the picture it gives us of the growing opposition to the Third Reich, the first beginnings

A Moses of the Mormons

CROWN of GLORY

By O. W. Riegel

The colorful biography of one of America's most astonishing religious zealots, James Jesse Strang, who broke away from the parent body of Mormons, provided his own set of brass-tablets to establish his claim to semi-divinity, and founded a kingdom of his own on an island off Michigan. There, through his ability to combine the graces of religious leadership with astute political science and high oratory, he became an important frontier figure, winning all of his battles against the forces of evil but one—and that was the last one. Mr. Riegel has written an entertaining, exciting and sound biography which will take its place as a valuable contribution to Americana.

281 pages—$3.00

YALE UNIVERSITY PRESS, ***New Haven, Conn.***

THE SOVIET UNION AND WORLD-PROBLEMS

With war clouds deepening, the world is asking—What is the attitude of the Bolsheviks toward war? This new book contains five important studies of the Soviet foreign policy, and nationality policy—by ALEXANDER A. TROYANOVSKY, Ambassador of the U.S.S.R. at Washington; IVAN V. BOYEFF, VLADIMIR ROMM, HANS KOHN, MALBONE W. GRAHAM. Edited by Samuel N. Harper.

Just published. $2.50

•

THE TURKISH TRANSFORMATION

What has happened in all the days that have followed since the forty days of Musa Dagh? HENRY E. ALLEN'S keen interpretation of the amazing modernization of this Moslem country is published on the 12th anniversary of the Turkish Republic. $2.50

The University of Chicago Press

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

of organization among the prisoners. Before the doors of the prison huts, Nazi patrols walk their beat. Within the huts, the prisoners conduct political discussion under the guise of language study. They discuss, for example, how to win over the Nazi guards. And when the Communists among them are incited to maltreat the imprisoned socialist leaders Ernst Heilman and Friedrich Ebert, even promised immunity in exchange for that favor, they stand fast. In its account of cruelty and inhuman treatment the book is depressing; but in these glimpses of prisoners standing back to back it is an encouraging sign, an indication that men of all shades of opinion are beginning to stand together against the common enemy. K. R.

Contributors

ALEXANDER WERTH is Paris correspondent for The Manchester Guardian. He has been a keen student of post-war political developments on the Continent, and early this year wrote a book, "France in Ferment," which was published in this country by Harper's.

ELEANOR CLARK had an opportunity to observe Italian Fascist methods and psychology during two years' residence in Italy, including study at the University of Rome.

JAMES BROUGHTON is a native San Franciscan who received his A.B. degree from Stanford University last June and spent the summer making what he describes as a "shoe-string" trip to Europe. He is now doing free-lance journalistic work in New York City.

DOROTHY BAKER is the wife of Howard Baker, California novelist and author of "Orange Valley." She has written short stories and poems.

ELIZABETH DARYUSH is the daughter of Robert Bridges. She has written several volumes of poetry, the latest of which, "Verses: Book IV," was published last year by the Oxford University Press.

SAMUEL BERNSTEIN, author of "The Beginnings of Marxian Socialism in France," is preparing a study on "Proletarian Dictatorship from Babeuf to Lenin."

LANCELOT HOGBEN is professor of Social Biology in the London School of Economics. He has published numerous works on genetics, zoölogy and biochemistry.

SLATER BROWN has been a member of the editorial staffs of The New Republic and The New Masses, and is now editing a labor paper in Easton, Pennsylvania.

MARTHA GRUENING has written on various aspects of race relations and was formerly field research secretary for the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People.

POWERS HAPGOOD, a member of the writing family that includes his uncles, Norman and Hutchins Hapgood, for many years has been a student of the labor movement, especially in the coal industry.

The initials signed to the brief reviews are those of Lionel Trilling, Harold Ward, B. H. Haggin and Dr. Kurt Rosenfeld.

THEATERS

THE THEATRE GUILD *Presents*
(In association with JOHN C. WILSON)
The Taming of the Shrew
with ALFRED LUNT & LYNN FONTANNE
GUILD THEATRE, 52nd Street, West of Broadway
Evgs. 8:40. Matinees Thursday & Saturday, 2:40

THE THEATRE GUILD *Presents*
GEORGE GERSHWIN'S
PORGY and BESS
Book by Du Bose Heyward
Lyrics by Du Bose Heyward and Ira Gershwin
Directed by ROUBEN MAMOULIAN
ALVIN THEATRE, 52nd St., W. of Broadway. Evgs. 8:30
——Matinees Thursday and Saturday, 2:30——

Opens Wed. Nov. 6—Seats now on sale
"LET FREEDOM RING"
BROADHURST THEA. 44th St. W. of Broadway | SEATS 4 WEEKS IN ADVANCE
Special Pre-Opening Benefit
NOV. 5th (Election Night)
For LABOR CHALLENGE
The Unemployed and Project Workers Paper
Tickets at Room 437, 80 East 11th Street. STuyvesant 9-6982
And on November 4 and 5 at Theater Box Office

WINTER GARDEN B'way & 50th Evenings 8:30 | Mats Thurs & Sat. 2:30 — EXTRA MATINEE — Election Day, November 5.
BEATRICE LILLIE
IN
AT HOME ABROAD
AND
ETHEL WATERS
HERB WILLIAMS and ELEANOR POWELL
A Musical Holiday by DIETZ and SCHWARTZ
A Vincente Minnelli Production

VIAJES A MEXICO
for those who want to visit
The Mexico Not in Guide Books
Trips the year around
sponsored and arranged by:
THE COMMITTEE ON CULTURAL RELATIONS WITH LATIN AMERICA
289 Fourth Ave. New York

A Delightful Hide-Away
in the mountains inviting people of better taste. Excellent table, solariums, seasonable sports. Library, musicals, open fireplaces.
Chesters' Zunbarg
Woodbourne, N. Y. Tel: Fallsburg 2F 22

SCHOOL

Hill and Hollow Farm
HYDE PARK, N. Y.
Send your child to the country—while you travel, get well, or finish the job that needs quiet concentration. A modern home and country advantages plus complete nursery school supervision for children, 2 to 6. Children accepted for short periods. Reasonable rates. Highly recommended. Mr. and Mrs. Paul Garrigue, Hyde Park, New York (in Dutchess County, 2 hrs. from New York City). Tel.: Hyde Park, 61 F 31.

23 LANGUAGES
SPEAK ANY MODERN LANGUAGE IN 3 MONTHS BY LINGUAPHONE
UNIQUE METHOD BRINGS VOICES OF NATIVE MASTERS INTO YOUR OWN HOME..SEND FOR FREE BOOK
LINGUAPHONE INSTITUTE
41 Rockefeller Center · New York

SOCIAL INSURANCE

MEN, WOMEN AND THEIR CHILDREN interested in insuring against the costs of hospital care in the event of illness or injury, write for details to Dept. 166, The First Mutual Health Insurance Company of Wilmington, Delaware.
Benefits include semi-private accommodations, X-ray, use of the operating room, anaesthetic and laboratory examinations.

HELP WANTED

WRITER. Must have background and be able to write about public affairs clearly and vividly. Send snapshot photo and give full particulars including salary expected. Position outside New York. Address: Box 899, The New Republic.

YOUNG MAN of high intellectual caliber, good speaker, with ability as organizer and an acquaintance with the labor movement, to take charge of radical Jewish youth organization. State age and qualifications. Address Box 900, The New Republic.

FREE!
For You and Your Friends
PERIODIC LISTS OF BOOKS PAMPHLETS AND PERIODICALS
of interest to socially-minded people. Free to the first 100 replies received: A 4-page printed "Guide to Readings in Communism." Write to:
WORKERS' BOOKSHOP
Dept. M, 50 East 13th Street, N. Y. C.

PAUL LUTTINGER, M. D.
and
DANIEL LUTTINGER, M.D.
5 Washington Square North
Office hours: 1—2, 6—8
Except Sundays and Holidays
Telephones:
GRamercy 7-2090 — GRamercy 7-2091

CORRESPONDENCE CLUB

PROCRASTINATION DEPRIVES thousands of the genuine happiness radiated by 1500 CONTACTS members. Unusual books loaned free. Investigate now! Send 3c stamp to CONTACTS, Box 91, Station D., N. Y. C.

WORKERS' COLLEGE

COLLEGE FOR WORKERS in Ozarks. Total cost $50 for 3 months, start Dec. 30. Commonwealth College, Mena, Ark.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED